



United States Department of Justice

Office on Violence Against Women

Working Together to End the Violence

S•T•O•P Program

Services • Training • Officers
• Prosecutors

2012 Report
Part B

Contents

Contents	i
List of Tables.....	ii
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program.....	2
Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds	6
Eligibility Requirements.....	6
Reporting Requirements	8
Reporting Methods	9
STOP Program 2009 and 2010: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds	11
Sources of Data	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators	11
How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees.....	13
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed	14
Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds.....	15
Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects	16
Effectiveness of the STOP Program.....	19
Coordinated Community Response.....	19
Training.....	26
Victim Services	33
Underserved Populations.....	37
American Indians and Alaska Natives.....	40
Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Older Victims/survivors.....	43
Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees	47
Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas.....	49
The Criminal Justice Response	52
Law Enforcement.....	52
Prosecution.....	58
Courts	62
Probation Supervision	65
Sexual Assault.....	69
Stalking	75
Remaining Areas of Need	80
STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments.....	87
Training.....	88
Coordinated Community Response.....	89
Policies.....	91
Products.....	92
Data Collection and Communication Systems	93
Specialized Units.....	94
System Improvement	95
Victim Services	96
Demographics of Victims/survivors Served	98

Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors	100
Protection Orders	101
Criminal Justice	102
Law Enforcement	102
Prosecution	104
Courts.....	105
Probation	107
Batterer Intervention Program	109
References	111
Appendix A 2009	125
Appendix B 2009	133
Appendix A 2010	145
Appendix B 2010	153

List of Tables

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2009	11
Allocation category	11
Table 1b. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2010	12
Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010.....	15
Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010.....	16
Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2009 and 2010	17
Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2009 and 2010	26
Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010—selected professional positions	32
Table 7. Victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2009 and 2010.....	35
Table 8. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2009 and 2010	65
Table 9. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2009 and 2010	69
Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2009 and 2010	87
Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010.....	88
Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2009.....	89
Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2010.....	90
Table 13a. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2009.....	91
Table 13b. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2010.....	92
Table 14. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2009 and 2010.....	93

Table 15. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2009 and 2010	94
Table 16a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2009	94
Table 16b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2010	94
Table 17a. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2009	95
Table 17b. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2010	95
Table 18a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2009	95
Table 18b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2010	96
Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, by level of service and type of victimization	96
Table 19b. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2010, by level of service and type of victimization	97
Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010, by type of victimization.....	97
Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees.....	98
Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010.....	98
Table 23a. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2009	99
Table 23b. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2010	100
Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010.....	100
Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2009 and 2010	102
Table 26a. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2009	103
Table 26b. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2010	103
Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence / dating violence, stalking and related cases by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2009 and 2010	104
Table 28a. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2009.....	106
Table 28b. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2010.....	106
Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009 and 2010, by type and number of contacts.....	107
Table 30a. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009.....	108
Table 30b. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2010.....	108
Table 31. Outcomes of offenders in STOP-funded BIP programs in 2009 and 2010	109
Table A1a. Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009.....	126
Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2009.....	129

Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010 131

Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009..... 134

Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009..... 136

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009..... 138

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009..... 141

Table B5a. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2009 143

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010 146

Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2010 149

Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010 151

Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010..... 155

Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010 157

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010..... 159

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010..... 162

Table B5b. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2010..... 164

Acknowledgments

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) gratefully acknowledges the work of the staff of the Violence Against Women Act Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School); the staff played a central role in the development of this report to Congress.

In addition, we wish to express our appreciation to the STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (STOP Program) administrators and subgrantees who collected and reported the data on which this report is based and who worked with the Muskie School to ensure the accuracy of the data. OVW also thanks the administrators and subgrantees who provided detailed narrative data about their STOP Program-funded activities and about the impact of STOP Program funding on their states and communities. This information has added significant depth and detail to this report, providing specific examples of the STOP Program's accomplishments on behalf of women who are victims/survivors of violence.

Bea Hanson
Acting Director
Office on Violence Against Women
U.S. Department of Justice

Introduction

The *STOP (Services • Training • Officers • Prosecutors) Program 2012 Report*¹ is submitted in response to the statutory requirement that the U.S. Attorney General provide a biennial report to Congress on the STOP Program, including how funds were used and an evaluation of the effectiveness of funded programs. Part B of this Report is based on data submitted by STOP administrators and STOP subgrantees reflecting STOP awards made and STOP Program-funded activities engaged in during calendar years 2009 and 2010.²

The section entitled “Background” (page 2) sets out the statutory origins and outlines of the STOP Program—the Program’s goals, the allocation and distribution of STOP Program funds, and states’ eligibility, reporting requirements, and reporting methods.³ “STOP Program 2009 and 2010: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds” (page 11) describes the sources of the data and how funds were used during calendar years 2009 and 2010—what types of agencies and organizations received funding and the types of activities in which they engaged. “Effectiveness of the STOP Programs” (page 19) describes key activities carried out with STOP Program funds, discusses why they are important, and provides examples of specific STOP Program-funded programs and initiatives engaging in those activities. “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments” (page 87) presents the data reported by subgrantees in greater detail. Finally, Appendix A and Appendix B present data on the number and amounts of awards in the mandated allocation categories (i.e., victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and courts), culturally-specific awards, allocations by victimization, and the number and characteristics of victims/survivors served on a state-by-state basis.

More extensive discussion of the prevalence of violence against women and what research and practice have shown to be effective strategies for responding to the violence can be found in the *2012 Biennial Report to Congress on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs Under the Violence Against Women Act (2012 Biennial Report)*.

¹ The STOP report previous to this one, called the *STOP Program 2010 Report*, was based on 2007 STOP Program data, which is reported annually, and was submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2010; this 2012 report is based on 2008, 2009, and 2010 data and is submitted in response to the biennial reporting requirement for 2012. Part A of this report is based on 2008 data only. Part B of the report is based on 2009 and 2010 data, which will bring STOP Program reporting into timely conformance with the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) 2005 requirement for biennial reporting on the effectiveness of all grant programs, including the STOP Program. Previous STOP Program reports can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/ovwrptcongress.htm>. The STOP Program 2014 Report, based on 2011 and 2012 data, will also be timely and in compliance with those reporting requirements.

² During this time period, data have also been collected from grantees that received additional funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). This report does not include data from STOP grantees funded under ARRA. That data will be addressed at the completion of these awards.

³ Throughout this report, the word “state” is intended to refer to *all* recipients of STOP awards—i.e., the 50 states, the 5 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia.

Background

Statutory Purpose Areas of the STOP Program

The STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program, also known as the STOP Program, was authorized by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law No. 103–322), and reauthorized and amended by VAWA 2000 (Public Law No. 106–386) and VAWA 2005 (Public Law No. 109–162). The STOP Program, which funds states and territories, promotes a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system’s response to violent crimes against women and increasing the availability of victim services. The program encourages the development and strengthening of effective law enforcement, prosecution, and judicial strategies and victim services.

By statute, STOP Program funds may be used for the following purposes:⁴

- ▶ Training law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence
- ▶ Developing, training, or expanding units of law enforcement officers, judges, other court personnel, and prosecutors specifically targeting violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence
- ▶ Developing and implementing more effective police, court, and prosecution policies, protocols, orders, and services specifically devoted to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence
- ▶ Developing, installing, or expanding data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, linking police, prosecutors, and courts or for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence

⁴ VAWA 2005 added three purpose areas to the STOP Program, which are included as the last three bullets in this list. STOP subgrantees began reporting that their activities addressed these new purpose areas for the first time during calendar year 2008; prior to that, the reporting form did not allow them to do so.

- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence programs, developing or improving delivery of victim services to underserved populations, providing specialized domestic violence court advocates in courts where a significant number of protection orders are granted, and increasing reporting and reducing attrition rates for cases involving violent crimes against women, including crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence
- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing stalking
- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs addressing the needs and circumstances of Indian tribes in dealing with violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault and domestic violence
- ▶ Supporting formal and informal statewide, multidisciplinary efforts, to the extent not supported by state funds, to coordinate the response of state law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, victim-services agencies, and other state agencies and departments, to violent crimes against women, including the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence
- ▶ Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the collection and preservation of evidence, analysis, prevention, and providing expert testimony and treatment of trauma related to sexual assault
- ▶ Developing, enlarging, or strengthening programs to assist law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and others to address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, including recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of such violence or assault and targeting outreach and support, counseling, and other victim services to such older and disabled individuals
- ▶ Providing assistance to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters
- ▶ Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives, while supporting complementary new initiatives and emergency services for victims and their families
- ▶ Supporting the placement of special victim assistants (to be known as “Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants”) in local law enforcement agencies to serve as liaisons between victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and personnel in local law enforcement agencies in order to improve the enforcement of protection orders. Jessica Gonzales

Victim Assistants shall have expertise in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and may undertake the following activities:

- ▶ Notifying persons seeking enforcement of protection orders as to what responses will be provided by the relevant law enforcement agency
- ▶ Referring persons seeking enforcement of protection orders to supplementary services (such as emergency shelter programs, hotlines, or legal assistance services)
- ▶ Taking other appropriate action to assist or secure the safety of the person seeking enforcement of a protection order
- ▶ To provide funding to law enforcement agencies, nonprofit nongovernmental victim services providers, and State, tribal, territorial, and local governments, (which funding stream shall be known as the Crystal Judson Domestic Violence Protocol Program) to promote:
 - ▶ The development and implementation of training for local domestic violence victim service providers, and to fund victim services personnel, to be known as “Crystal Judson Victim Advocates,” to provide supportive services and advocacy for victims of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel
 - ▶ The implementation of protocols within law enforcement agencies to ensure consistent and effective responses to the commission of domestic violence by personnel within such agencies (such as the model policy promulgated by the International Association of Chiefs of Police [‘Domestic Violence by Police Officers: A Policy of the IACP, Police Response to Violence Against Women Project’ July 2003])
 - ▶ The development of such protocols in collaboration with State, tribal, territorial and local victim service providers and domestic violence coalitions

The emphasis of the STOP Program continues to be on the implementation of comprehensive strategies addressing violence against women that are sensitive to the needs and safety of victims⁵ and that hold offenders accountable for their crimes. States carry out these strategies by forging lasting partnerships between the criminal justice system and victim-advocacy organizations and by encouraging communities to look beyond traditional resources to new partners, such as faith-

⁵ In most instances this report’s use of the term “victim” is also intended to include “survivor,” as in “victim/survivor.” Exceptions include certain statutory wording and other terms of art that refer only to “victim”; in those instances the original wording has not been changed. The word “victim” may also appear without “survivor” to avoid awkward wording or to simplify displays of data.

based and community organizations, to respond more vigorously to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes.

For fiscal year 2009, states were encouraged to develop and support projects to:

- ▶ Implement culturally competent services and community-driven initiatives, utilizing faith-based and community organizations, to address the needs of underserved, cultural and linguistic populations as defined by VAWA, including people with disabilities and elder victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking
- ▶ Address sexual assault and stalking through service expansion; development and implementation of protocols; training for judges, other court personnel, prosecutors, and law enforcement; and development of coordinated community responses to violence against women
- ▶ Enhance or strengthen statewide collaboration efforts among law enforcement, prosecution, non-profit/non-governmental victim service providers, including faith-based and community organizations; and courts in addressing violence against women
- ▶ Develop, strengthen or enhance statewide court initiatives that implement innovative court procedures and practices to address violence against women

For fiscal year 2010, states were encouraged to develop and support projects that:

- ▶ Support core services for victims of sexual and domestic violence, particularly support for rape crisis centers and shelters
- ▶ Expand the options available to battered women by increasing and expanding the utilization of civil legal services, particularly for battered women who are in danger of losing custody to perpetrators of sexual and domestic violence
- ▶ Provide comprehensive culturally specific services beyond bilingual advocacy
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training to Tribal law enforcement and Tribal courts
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training to target elder abuse violence against women programs
- ▶ Provide basic and advanced training and services that address the intersection of domestic violence and prisoner reentry, providing advocacy services to battered women convicted of crimes, victims of prison rape, and women whose batterers are returning from prison

Allocation and Distribution of STOP Program Funds

The United States Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Program according to a statutory formula. All states, including the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia, are eligible to apply for STOP Program grants to address the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Funds are distributed to the states according to the following formula: a base award of \$600,000 is made to each state, and

remaining funds [are awarded] to each state in an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of remaining funds as the population of the state bears to the population of all of the states that results from a distribution among the states on the basis of each state’s population in relation to the population of all states (not including populations of Indian tribes (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(b)(5) and (6)).

Funds granted to the states are then subgranted to agencies and programs, including state offices and agencies, state and local courts, units of local government, tribal governments, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victim-services programs. Each state determines the process by which it awards subgrants.⁶ STOP Program awards may support up to 75 percent of the costs of all projects receiving subgrants, including the cost of administering those subgrants; the remaining 25 percent of costs must be covered by nonfederal match sources.⁷

The statute requires each state to distribute STOP Program funds as follows: 25 percent for law enforcement; 25 percent for prosecution; 30 percent for victim services, of which at least 10 percent shall be distributed to culturally specific community-based organizations; and 5 percent for state and local courts, including juvenile courts. The use of the remaining 15 percent is discretionary, within parameters defined by the statute (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(c)(3)).

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible to receive STOP Program funds, states must meet all application requirements and certify that they are in compliance with certain statutory requirements of VAWA. First, the states’ laws, policies, and practices must not require victims of domestic violence to incur costs related to prosecution, or victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to incur costs related to obtaining protection orders; and, second, states must certify that a government entity incurs

⁶ The state official(s) designated to administer STOP Program formula funds will be referred to in this report as the “STOP administrator(s).”

⁷ VAWA 2005, as amended, contains a new provision eliminating match in certain circumstances and providing for waivers of match in other circumstances (42 U.S.C. section 13925(b)(1)). Data reported by STOP subgrantees and presented in this report reflect activities supported both by STOP Program funding and by required nonfederal match sources.

the full out-of-pocket costs of forensic medical exams for sexual assault victims (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–(5)(a); 3796gg–(4)(a)).

A state application for STOP Program funding must include documentation from prosecution, law enforcement, court, and victim services programs that demonstrate the need for grant funds, how they intend to use the funds, the expected results, and the demographic characteristics of the populations to be served (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)). VAWA 2005 added the requirement that states provide documentation showing that

tribal, territorial, State or local prosecution, law enforcement, and courts have consulted with tribal, territorial, State, or local victim service programs during the course of developing their grant applications in order to ensure that proposed services, activities and equipment acquisitions are designed to promote the safety, confidentiality, and economic independence of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(d)).

Within 120 days of receiving a STOP Program grant, states are required to submit implementation plans describing their identified goals and how funds will be used to accomplish these goals.⁸ States that have previously submitted a 3-year plan must certify how, or whether, the previous plan has changed. States are required to consult with nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. States are strongly encouraged to include Indian tribal governments in their planning processes.

The implementation plans describe how states will:

- ▶ Give priority to areas of varying geographic size with the greatest showing of need, based on the current availability of existing domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the population, and geographic area to be served in relation to the availability of such programs in other such populations and geographic areas
- ▶ Determine the amount of subgrants based on the population and geographic area to be served
- ▶ Distribute monies equitably on a geographic basis, including nonurban and rural areas of varying geographic sizes
- ▶ Recognize and address the needs of underserved populations and ensure that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally specific services and activities for underserved populations are distributed equitably among those populations

⁸ Beginning in fiscal year 2003, OVW permitted states to satisfy the implementation plan requirement by submitting 3-year implementation plans and annual updates.

State implementation plans also describe the involvement of victim services providers and advocates; major shifts in direction; how the state’s approach to violence against women will build on earlier efforts, how funds will be distributed to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim services categories; the types of programs the grantee intends to support; whether funds will be directed to the Crystal Judson Domestic Violence Protocol Program; and how the success of grant-funded activities will be evaluated.

Reporting Requirements

VAWA 1994 required that the Attorney General provide an annual report to Congress on the STOP Program no later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year for which grants are made. Amendments made by VAWA 2005 require that future reports be submitted no later than 1 month after the end of each even-numbered fiscal year (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–3(b)). The statute requires that the report include the following information for each state receiving funds:

- ▶ The number of grants made and funds distributed
- ▶ A summary of the purposes for which those grants were provided and an evaluation of their progress
- ▶ Statistical summary of persons served, detailing the nature of victimization and providing data on age, sex, relationship to the offender, geographic distribution, race, ethnicity, language, disability, and the membership of persons served in any underserved population
- ▶ An evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded with STOP Program monies (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–3(b))

In VAWA 2000, Congress broadened existing reporting provisions to require the Attorney General to submit a biennial report to Congress on the effectiveness of activities of VAWA-funded grant programs (Public Law No. 106–386, section 1003 (codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p)). In response to this statutory mandate, and as part of a broader effort to improve measurements of program performance, OVW worked with the VAWA Measuring Effectiveness Initiative at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine (Muskie School), to develop meaningful measures of program effectiveness and new progress report forms for all OVW grant programs, including the STOP Program.

Measuring the effectiveness of the STOP Program and other OVW-funded grant programs is a uniquely challenging task. Between 1998 and 2003, states receiving STOP Program funds were required to submit data in the Subgrant Award and Performance Report (SAPR) reflecting how they and their subgrantees were using these funds. However, OVW was interested in gathering information about all grant-funded activities in a more uniform and comprehensive manner.

In late 2001, the Muskie School and OVW began developing progress report forms for grantees to use to collect data and report on their activities and effectiveness. This process was informed by extensive consultation with OVW grantees, experts in the field, and OVW staff concerning the kinds of measures that would best reflect the goals of the OVW grant programs and whether those goals were being achieved. The report forms included measures identified in the collaborative process and outcome measures identified by OVW as indicators of the effectiveness of the funded programs for purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

The progress report forms were designed to satisfy OVW grantees' semiannual (discretionary grant programs) and annual (STOP Program) reporting requirements. To the extent possible, given the goals and activities authorized under each of the grant programs, uniform measures were chosen to permit the aggregation of data and reporting across grant programs. In addition to generating data for the monitoring of individual grantee's activities, the report forms enabled OVW to review the activities and achievements of entire grant programs, as well as the aggregate achievements of numerous grant programs engaged in similar activities. This new grantee reporting system contributes to better long-term trend analysis, planning, and policy development. It also enhances OVW's ability to report to Congress in greater detail and depth about the programs funded by VAWA and related legislation.

Reporting Methods

OVW finalized the STOP administrator and subgrantee report forms for the STOP Program in early 2005 and worked with Muskie School staff on revisions to the forms to reflect VAWA 2005 changes. Throughout this period, the Muskie School has provided ongoing, extensive training and technical assistance to state STOP administrators in completing the forms.⁹ Administrators submit annual STOP administrators reports online through the Office of Justice Program's Grants Management System; STOP Program subgrantees submit electronic versions of the annual progress report to their state STOP administrators. Currently, states are required to submit both reports to OVW by March 30 of each year.

⁹ Because of the large number of subgrantees (approximately 2,400), Muskie School staff provide the STOP administrators with training and technical assistance with the understanding that the STOP administrators will train their state's subgrantees in how to complete the subgrantee progress reporting form. A recently released self-paced online tutorial on how to complete the STOP subgrantee progress reporting form is available for use by subgrantees and can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulatrain.htm#online>

STOP Program 2009 and 2010: State-Reported Data and Distribution of Funds

Sources of Data

This report is based on data submitted by 2,305 subgrantees in 2009 and 2,274 subgrantees in 2010 from all 50 states, all 5 territories, and the District of Columbia, as well as data submitted by the 56 STOP administrators about the distribution and use of program funds during calendar years 2009 and 2010. Under a cooperative agreement with OVW, the Muskie School has analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from two sources: subgrantees completing the Annual Progress Report and grant administrators completing the Annual STOP Administrators Report.¹⁰

How STOP Program Funds Were Distributed: STOP Administrators

The statute authorizing the STOP Program requires that each state distribute its funds according to a specific formula: at least 25 percent each for law enforcement and prosecution, 30 percent for victim services, and 5 percent for state and local courts (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg-1(c)(3)).¹¹ Tables 1a and 1b show the number and distribution of subgrant awards for each of the allocation categories in 2009 and 2010.

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2009

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	244	5,440,858	4
Law enforcement	943	29,485,969	24
Prosecution	809	29,748,897	25
Victim services	1,421	42,395,776	35
Administration	NA	7,099,498	6

¹⁰ These two report forms replaced the Subgrant Award Performance Report forms (SAPRs) originally designed by the Urban Institute in cooperation with the National Institute of Justice. State administrators and subgrantees reported on their activities on the SAPRs from 1998 through 2003. The data derived from the SAPRs formed the basis of the 2000, 2002, and 2004 STOP Program Reports. This 2012 STOP Program Report is the fifth report to contain data generated from the Annual STOP Administrators' Report and the STOP subgrantee Annual Progress Report. The two forms can be found at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/vawamei/stopformulaform.htm>.

¹¹ STOP Program funds awarded for law enforcement and prosecution may be used to support victim advocates and victim-witness specialists in those agencies.

Table 1a. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2009

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Discretionary ¹²	211	6,992,597	6
Total	3,628	121,163,595	100

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A. More specific information regarding types of activities engaged with STOP Program funds, based on data from subgrantee Annual Progress Reports, is available on a state-by-state basis in Appendix B.

NA = not applicable

Table 1b. Number and distribution of STOP subgrant awards made in 2010

Allocation category	Number of awards to subgrantees	Total funding in category (\$)	Percentage of total dollars awarded
Courts	270	7,327,841	5
Law enforcement	914	36,592,875	25
Prosecution	801	34,993,756	24
Victim services	1,493	51,371,186	34
Administration	NA	10,844,065	7
Discretionary ¹³	262	7,952,147	5
Total	3,740	149,081,870	100

NOTE: Data derived from the Annual STOP Administrators Reports. Information by award category on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A. More specific information regarding types of activities engaged in with STOP Program funds, based on data from subgrantee Annual Progress Reports, is available on a state-by-state basis in Appendix B.

NA = not applicable

VAWA 2005 requires states to award at least 10 percent of the mandated 30 percent they must award to victim services to culturally-specific, community-based organizations in an effort to ensure

recognition and meaningful response to the needs of underserved populations and ensure that monies set aside to fund linguistically and culturally specific services and activities for underserved populations are distributed equitably among those populations (42 U.S.C. section 3796gg–1(c)(3)(B)).

¹² Examples of awards reported in this category include training and technical assistance to law enforcement, sexual assault nurse examiners (SANEs), and government agency staff; SANE programs; batterer intervention programs (BIPs); data collection systems; supervised visitation and exchange; and coordinated community response (CCR).

¹³ Examples of awards reported in this category include training to law enforcement, medical personnel, and SANEs; fatality review; technology projects such as database and communication systems for criminal justice subgrantees; CCR; and BIPs.

In 2009, 52 states made 271 awards totaling \$9,610,196 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 22.7 percent of funds awarded for victim services. In 2010, 53 states made 279 awards totaling \$10,634,157 to culturally specific victim services organizations, accounting for 22.2 percent of funds awarded for victim services.¹⁴

How STOP Program Funds Were Used: Subgrantees

The overwhelming majority (95 percent) of the subgrantee agencies and organizations used STOP Program monies to fund staff positions, most often professional positions providing direct services to victims/survivors. When staff allocations are translated to full-time equivalents (FTEs), staff providing direct services to victims/survivors represent 55 percent of the total STOP Program-funded FTEs.¹⁵ By comparison, law enforcement officers represent 10 percent of FTEs and prosecutors represent 10 percent.

Another way of looking at the distribution of STOP Program funds is to consider the percentage of subgrantees reporting that funds were used for specific categories of activities.¹⁶ An annual average¹⁷ of 67 percent of subgrantees reported using funds to provide services to victims/survivors, 43 percent used funds to provide training, 33.2 percent to develop or implement policies and/or to develop products, 13 percent for law enforcement activities, 13 percent for prosecution activities, and 1 percent each for court and probation activities.

In 2009 and 2010, STOP Program funds were used to carry out the program's fundamental activities of offering victim services, providing training, and supporting law enforcement and prosecutors.

Services. An average of approximately 453,000 victims/survivors received services supported by STOP Program funds each year (of 459,000 victims/survivors who sought services). Although the majority were white (55 percent), female (91 percent), and between the ages of 25 and 59 (67 percent), subgrantees reported that 23 percent of the victims/survivors they served were black or African-American,

¹⁴ Detailed information regarding amounts of awards/percentages to culturally-specific, community-based organizations on a state-by-state basis is available in Appendix A, Table A3a and A3b.

¹⁵ These staff categories include victim advocates, victim-witness specialists, counselors, legal advocates, and attorneys.

¹⁶ Some subgrantees receive funds to pay for a portion of a shelter advocate's salary; others may receive funding for a number of full-time advocates. This analysis considers only the number of subgrantees that used their funds in these ways, regardless of the amount of STOP Program funding they received. Because subgrantees often fund more than one category of activity, these percentages will total more than 100 percent.

¹⁷ Throughout this report, averages represent averages per reporting period (i.e., the calendar year) and are based on 2009 and 2010 data. Because subgrantees, grant-funded staff, and victims/survivors carry over from one reporting period to another, it is not accurate to provide a total for these types of data.

and 18 percent were Hispanic or Latino.¹⁸ Twenty-six percent of the victims/survivors served were reported as living in rural areas. Victims/survivors used victim advocacy (210,800), crisis intervention (202,300), and criminal justice advocacy (148,800) in greater numbers than any other services.¹⁹ In addition, a total²⁰ of more than 679,000 hotline calls were received from primary victims/survivors during 2009 and 2010.

Training. From the inception of the STOP Program, states and their subgrantees have recognized the critical need to educate first responders about violence against women. The fact that 30 percent of all people trained with STOP Program funds (a total of more than 148,600 individuals) during this 2-year period were law enforcement officers reflects the fact that the grant program is fulfilling one of its primary and original purposes. Victim advocates comprised the next largest category, with a total of 51,600 trained. A total of more than 490,400 professionals or volunteers acting in the role of a professional were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2-year period.

Officers. Law enforcement agencies used STOP Program funds to respond to nearly 150,000 calls for assistance, to investigate more than 152,600 incidents of violence, and to serve nearly 39,000 protection orders during the 2-year period. STOP Program-funded officers arrested nearly 60,000 offenders and made only 2,350 dual arrests.

Prosecutors. STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of a total of nearly 208,000 cases during calendar years 2009 and 2010, with an overall conviction rate of 68 percent.²¹ Approximately 127,500 of those were domestic violence misdemeanor cases, 66 percent of which were disposed of through convictions.

Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed

Subgrantees reported using STOP Program funds for 14 statutory purposes. Table 2 lists these purpose areas and reports the number of projects addressing each area during calendar years 2009 and 2010. Consistent with other reported data, the purpose area most frequently addressed by subgrantees was victim services projects.

¹⁸ These percentages are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom race/ethnicity was known. This may represent an undercounting of the true number of underserved because race/ethnicity for nearly 10 percent of victims/survivors was reported as unknown for these reporting periods. Hotline services, for example, generally do not collect this race/ethnicity information, as it could prevent victims/survivors from seeking further help. Whenever collecting demographic information on victims/survivors presents a barrier to service, or could violate confidentiality or jeopardize a victim/survivor's safety, service providers are advised not to collect it.

¹⁹ Victims/survivors were reported only once for each type of service received during the calendar year; these numbers are approximate averages.

²⁰ Throughout this report, unless otherwise indicated, "total" represents 2009 and 2010 data added together.

²¹ This rate includes deferred adjudications.

Table 2. Statutory purpose areas addressed with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

Purpose area	Average Subgrantees (N =2,290)	
	Average number	Percent
Training of law enforcement, judges, court personnel, and prosecutors	788	34
Policies, protocols, orders, and services	557	24
Specialized units (law enforcement, judges, court personnel, prosecutors)	568	25
Support of statewide coordinated community responses	386	17
Assistance to victims in immigration matters	312	14
Stalking initiatives	286	12
Maintaining core victim services and criminal justice initiatives	336	15
Development of data collection and communication systems	239	10
Programs to assist older and disabled victims	212	9
Training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners	138	6
Addressing the needs and circumstances of American Indian tribes	76	3
Supporting the placement of special victim assistants	48	2
Training, victim services, and protocols addressing domestic violence committed by law enforcement	24	1
Victim services projects	1,586	69

NOTE: Each subgrantee was able to select all relevant purpose areas addressed by their STOP Program-funded activities during calendar years 2009 and 2010. Thus, the total number of purpose areas is greater than the total number of subgrantees.

Types of Agencies Receiving STOP Program Funds

Not surprisingly, the number of domestic violence programs reported as receiving STOP Program funds was greater than that of any other type of agency or organization. Dual programs (programs that address both domestic violence and sexual assault) were the next most frequent recipients of STOP Program funding, followed by law enforcement and prosecution agencies. Table 3 presents a

complete list of the types of organizations receiving funding, as reported by subgrantees.

Table 3. Types of agencies receiving STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

Type of agency	2009 Subgrantees (N =2,305)		2010 Subgrantees (N =2,274)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Dual (domestic violence/sexual assault) program	504	21.9	495	21.8
Domestic violence program	458	19.9	411	18.1
Prosecution	367	15.9	363	16.0
Law enforcement	336	14.6	363	16.0
Sexual assault program	187	8.1	173	7.6
Community-based organization	68	3.0	94	4.1
Government agency	55	2.4	53	2.3
Unit of local government	54	2.3	48	2.1
Court	48	2.1	54	2.4
Sexual assault state coalition	44	1.9	44	1.9
Domestic violence state coalition	36	1.6	39	1.7
Probation, parole, or other correctional agency	24	1.0	30	1.3
Dual state coalition	24	1.0	23	1.0
University/school	12	.5	13	.6
Tribal domestic violence and/or sexual assault program	9	.4	8	.4
Tribal government	6	.3	6	.3
Tribal coalition	1	<.1	0	.0
Other	72	3.1	57	2.5

NOTE: Of the organizations listed above, an average of 55 reported that they were faith-based and 129 reported that they were culturally-specific, community-based organizations.

Types of Victimization Addressed by Funded Projects

The percentage of STOP Program-funded projects focused solely on domestic violence, dating violence decreased from 33 percent in 2008 to 31 percent in 2009 and decreased further to 29 percent in 2010. The percentage addressing domestic

violence, dating violence and either sexual assault or stalking rose from 55 percent in 2008 to 57 percent in 2009 and to 59 percent in 2010 (Table 4). The average combined percentage of projects focusing on sexual assault alone, stalking alone, or both sexual assault and stalking for the 2-year period remained approximately the same, at 12 percent.

Table 4. Types of victimization(s) addressed by STOP Program-funded projects in 2009 and 2010

Type of victimization	2009 Subgrantees (N =2,305)		2010 Subgrantees (N =2,274)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Domestic violence/dating violence only	714	31.0	659	29.0
Sexual assault only	253	11.0	256	11.3
Stalking only	5	.2	4	.2
Domestic violence/dating violence and sexual assault	359	15.6	375	16.5
Domestic violence/dating violence and stalking	100	4.3	83	3.6
Sexual assault and stalking	13	.6	10	.4
Domestic violence/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking	861	37.4	887	39.0

Effectiveness of the STOP Program

This section describes the key activities undertaken with STOP Program funds, with a focus on the specific areas listed in the statute. It discusses why the activities are important and how they contribute to the goals of VAWA—improving victim safety and increasing offender accountability. Program-wide accomplishments in these areas are highlighted, as are specific STOP Program-funded projects that demonstrate effective practices. (For a more detailed presentation of data reflecting the aggregate activities of all STOP Program-funded projects, see “STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments,” page 87.)

Coordinated Community Response

Developing and/or participating in a coordinated community response (CCR) to address violence against women is an essential and fundamental component of the STOP Program and all other OVW-funded programs. A CCR brings together criminal and civil justice personnel, victim advocates, social services program staff, and others to create a multidisciplinary, integrated response that holds offenders accountable for violent crimes against women and develops and strengthens services to the victims/survivors of these crimes. Research shows that efforts to respond to violence against women are most effective when integrated as part of a CCR (DePrince, Belknap, Labus, Buckingham, & Gover, 2012; Shepard & Pence, 1999; Shepard, 1999).

CCRs initially focused on reform of the criminal legal system. In many communities, representatives of women’s centers met with representatives of the legal system to discuss reforms in the operating protocols of each sector to enhance safety for victims and accountability for perpetrators. Policies and practices were modified, practitioners received training on the revisions in practice, and systems were developed to evaluate adherence to the reforms.

These reform efforts did not necessarily foster meaningful collaboration, however. Participants learned that more was needed, including a more unified vision of the goals of reform, fundamental principles of intervention, the roles of each sector, the merits of collaboration, and the need for public accountability. CCRs moved to cross-disciplinary collaborations that addressed the shortcomings of previous reform efforts.

An example of such cross-disciplinary collaboration is the “safety audit” process,²² which develops policies and implementation protocols, practice guidelines, and forms. The focus of an audit is the gap between institutional practices and the needs and experiences of both victims/survivors and perpetrators. The process engages all

²² Renamed “Best Practice Assessment of Community Response to Domestic Violence,” tools for Audits/Assessments in criminal justice and other government systems can be found at http://www.praxisinternational.org/praxis_safety_audits_resources.aspx.

sectors of the criminal legal system and victim services agencies in local, cross-disciplinary teams to examine current policies, protocols, guidelines, forms, and work routines and then evaluate whether they strengthen or impede safety for victims/survivors of domestic violence. The audits are then used to produce recommendations for systemic change (Praxis International, 2010).²³

For example, a Georgia study examined the impact of a CCR on community systems and attitudes. The study evaluated the criminal justice system's response in two counties to determine whether the practices of CCR participants changed because of their collaboration. It also documented the effect of CCR intervention on the legal sanctions imposed on batterers. CCR activities included the following: participation on a community task force on family violence, education of task force members on the elements of the CCR, implementation of a batterer intervention program (BIP), extensive training of law enforcement agencies, and a public awareness campaign. Researchers found statistically significant changes in systemic responses in responses after implementation of the CCR, including increases in the number of arrests in both counties and a higher prosecution rate in one county. In the county that increased its prosecution rate of domestic violence offenders, researchers observed that more offenders were sentenced to probation and BIPs and fewer received fines. However, there was no difference in the numbers of convicted offenders sentenced to jail or in the amount of jail time to which they were sentenced. The amount of the fines did increase (Salazar, Emshoff, Baker, & Crowley, 2007).

A study of participants in 51 domestic violence collaboratives in the Midwest framed the success of CCRs in terms of the capacity of the legal system and victim services and the benefits not just for victims but for CCR participants as well. The study found that organizations participating in domestic violence collaboratives experienced three types of mutually reinforcing outcomes, including increased knowledge and awareness of who does what in the community system, expanded social capital that results in increased referrals and services for victims, and increased influence in important decision-making processes within legal system sectors (Nowell & Foster-Fishman, 2011).

An evaluation of Illinois' statewide network of family violence coordinating councils, one of the major mechanisms for coordinating interagency intervention to address domestic violence, found that the councils facilitated stronger relationships and enhanced knowledge among stakeholders. This evaluation also found a positive relationship between the formation and development of the councils and the rate of emergency protection orders that became final orders (Allen et al., 2009).

A re-examination of data from 10 CCR projects funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified several factors associated with higher rates of

²³ In St. Paul, MN, a safety audit was the starting place for the development of the *"Blueprint for Safety: An Interagency Response to Domestic Violence Crimes"* (Pence & Eng, 2010).

victim/survivor contact with intimate partner violence (IPV)²⁴ services. Those factors included developing goals and selecting priorities based on community needs, coordinating services, and disseminating information on the prevalence of IPV in the community (Klevens, Baker, Shelley, & Ingram, 2008).

Traditionally, CCR has referred to the criminal justice system and organizations serving victims/survivors, but the concept of “community” may be expanded to include employers, churches, community groups, families, social groups, and neighbors. In particular, including employers in the coordinated response could impact a survivor’s financial security and—because employers are in a position to affect domestic violence-related policies and procedures in the workplace—they could contribute to changing social attitudes about IPV (Pennington-Zoellner, 2009).

The following is an example of a STOP Program-funded victim services agency that has reached out to community partners in three small towns, fostering relationships and creating a safety net for victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding allows us to dedicate advocate time to our outreach offices in Milo, Greenville, and Dexter [Maine]. This availability contributes to victims’ perception and reality of a community-based safety net which, in turn, fosters more community partnerships. For instance, our donated office space in Dexter is located next to the general assistance workers’ office, the community clothing closet, and food cupboard. Victims of domestic and dating violence are referred to other necessary services and vice versa. The environment fostered in this community space creates a safety net around victims who are then more likely to reach out and refer others for services.

—*Womencare/Aegis Association, Maine*

The statute authorizing the STOP Program specifically includes support for state-level, multidisciplinary efforts to coordinate the responses of justice systems, state agencies, and victim services to violent crimes against women. This effort is exemplified in the implementation planning process that takes place in every state. VAWA requires the state administering agencies to involve nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services programs, including domestic violence and sexual assault service programs, when developing their implementation plans. Administering agencies are also strongly encouraged to involve Indian tribal governments in the planning process. The creation of the STOP Program ensured a broad distribution of funds to criminal justice agencies (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation) and victim-services organizations.

The requirement that STOP Program-funded agencies communicate and collaborate with criminal justice system and community partners leads to the creation and

²⁴ “Intimate partner violence” and “domestic violence” are used interchangeably to mean violence that is committed by intimate partners.

implementation of protocols, an increase in cross-referrals, and a more comprehensive response to the needs of victims/survivors:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

[A] vital component of Pennsylvania's STOP Program is the longstanding requirement of county "STOP Coordinating Teams" in order to participate in the STOP Program. The STOP Coordinating Teams are comprised of representatives from victim services, law enforcement and prosecution as well as allied professionals from the community who meet four times per year to discuss how to more effectively serve victims of violence against women and ensure that the county STOP grant activities are on target. All coordinating teams have created and adopted protocols for response to domestic violence and sexual assault. Many are working on or nearing completion of protocols to address stalking. The teams have also fostered awareness of the dynamics of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking among team members, cross-referrals for services, and collective problem-solving and decision-making at the local level.

—STOP administrator, Pennsylvania

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The emphasis by the grant provider to coordinate our actions with those of other agencies that have joined in the fight against domestic violence convinced us of the need to pursue collaborative efforts on behalf of the victims. Instead of simply doing our part without further thought to other resources available to the victims, we became aware of other organizations and their ability to fill the needs of the victims that could not be met by the prosecutor's office. As a result, we are able to pursue criminal prosecution of these cases while, at the same time, directing the victims to the appropriate agencies that may assist them with counseling, shelter, emergency funds, and substance abuse issues.

—Baltimore County State's Attorney's Office, Maryland

CCR efforts at the community level often include sexual assault response teams (SARTs) and domestic abuse or domestic violence response teams (DARTs or DVRTs). SARTs, often organized around sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, coordinate the efforts of medical providers, counselors, advocates, and criminal justice agencies to improve the response to sexual assault victims/survivors. Some SARTs have case-specific discussions, while others study systemic responses. SART programs have been found to greatly enhance the quality of health care for women who have been sexually assaulted, improve the quality of forensic evidence, improve law enforcement's ability to collect information and to file charges, and increase the likelihood of successful prosecution (Campbell, Bybee, Ford, & Patterson, 2008; Campbell, Patterson, & Lichty, 2005; Crandall & Helitzer, 2003).

The collaborative nature and wide-ranging impact of STOP Program-funded SARTs and DARTs are illustrated in the following examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding allowed us the opportunity to provide the energized leadership and coordination required to sustain a fully participatory and effective sexual assault response team [SART]. In our county, the grant has paid for the organization and leadership of the SART, as well as ensuring effective victim advocacy participation at all times. The SART grant provided the staffing resources to take Tulare County from a place that had lost one hospital-based forensic program and was about to lose another, was unable to examine children, and did not have effective or well-attended multidisciplinary meetings to a county that has a solid and financially secure SANE program, has a permanent hospital-related exam site that is victim-centered and fully meets all confidentiality concerns. . . has regular SART meetings attended by up to 30 individuals including representatives of most of the 9 law enforcement agencies in the county, 2 to 3 ADA's [assistant district attorneys], probation, CWS [child welfare services], forensic nurses, and advocates. [The county also] has procedures for interagency problem solving, provides professional cross-training in order to strengthen appropriate and comprehensive victim support as well as successful arrest and prosecution, [and] has SART volunteers and backup volunteers on call for all nights and weekends. While we are a rural and relatively small community, we are forward-thinking. Our SART recognizes the need to not only maintain our comprehensive, coordinated services but also to reach out to a broader support constituency comprised of medical providers, the faith community, business, social services agencies, and other community-based programs.

—Family Services of Tulare County, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has been instrumental in the partnership development between the Coordinated Community Response Team/Sexual Assault Response Team and the law enforcement agencies, advocates, and prosecution. The funding has also provided much needed training for law enforcement, advocates, prosecution, mental health professionals, and social workers. This has provided the development of a communication pipeline for all disciplines, enhancing the services to the victim/survivor and ensuring the case has many checks and balances to lessen the chance of the case getting lost in the system.

—District Attorney District 27, Oklahoma

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The DART meetings with the Sparks Police Department keep an open and professional communication between our victim advocate, prosecutors, law enforcement, and their victim advocate. During these meetings, they discuss the different case scenarios and talk about creative ideas to improve their performance. They evaluate the suggestions from the group and provide detailed responses in their group meetings. They keep an open discussion about domestic violence cases and the implementation of any new laws, such as the strangulation law that became effective in July of 2009.

—*Sparks City Attorney, Nevada*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Coordinated community response activities are very beneficial for the victims we serve to assist them through a variety of needs. This past year a local regional SART was created that includes Vanderburgh, Warrick, and Posey counties. Working with the regional SART—made up of SANEs, mental health providers, advocates, advocacy center representatives, and the victim's assistant of the prosecutor's office—helps sexual assault victims in many ways. The effectiveness of the coordinated community response has allowed victims to report that they feel they have received support. They are allowed to get closure through an effective criminal justice process. They tell us that they feel their rights have been explained and respected and [they] gain a sense of empowerment.

—*Albion Fellows Bacon Center, Indiana*

All STOP subgrantees are required to report on the frequency of their contacts with community partners, both at the victim/case and systems levels. A significant number of subgrantees reported daily contact on specific victims or cases with the following organizations: law enforcement agencies (an average of 902, or 39 percent, of all subgrantees), domestic violence organizations (854, or 37 percent), courts (690, or 30 percent), and prosecutors (560, or 25 percent).²⁵ These interactions may have involved referrals (such as law enforcement referring a victim to a shelter or a victim services agency, or to the court for the victim to obtain a protection order) or consultations between victim services and law enforcement (such as sharing information on behalf of a victim on an offender's actions or whereabouts). Significant numbers of subgrantees also reported daily or weekly interactions with social services, health and mental health, legal services, and sexual assault organizations.

²⁵ More complete data on CCR activities can be found in Tables 12a and 12b.

The following subgrantee narrative describes the frequent interactions that can occur in STOP Program-funded CCRs:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The coordinated community response activities that are funded/supported by the STOP Program subgrant have been extremely beneficial in the prosecution of domestic violence in Marshall County. The domestic violence prosecutor attends weekly meetings with the Domestic Abuse Response Team, comprised of a detective from the police department, an advocate from the shelter, and a corrections officer. These meetings are used to exchange information about cases, get and give information regarding victim's services, and share ideas and suggestions.

—Marshall County Attorney's Office, Iowa

In addition to collaborating with other organizations in response to specific victims/survivors and crimes, subgrantees also work with community partners on task forces, workgroups, and in other forums on local, regional, and state levels. These groups often develop protocols establishing how organizations or agencies will respond in a coordinated fashion to ensure victim safety and offender accountability and remove barriers in the justice, victim services, and other systems. Ideally, participants are decisionmakers, able to direct the implementation of protocols and to promote coordination and collaboration.

These efforts can change attitudes, promote learning and communication, and lead to a better response to victims/survivors, as described below.

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The sexual assault resource team (SART) in Grafton County is comprised of law enforcement, sexual assault nurse examiners, counseling services, domestic violence crisis center advocates, and prosecutors. The SART team meets monthly and holds regular training for law enforcement in an effort to keep them apprised of best practices. Over the last year, a focus on strangulation (as new laws apply), domestic violence in an intimate partner environment, and a focus on sexual assaults perpetrated against victims through the use of alcohol have been a primary focus of the team. Through the team's collaboration, we have been able to move several cases that were stymied in the investigative component of the criminal process and move them forward toward adjudication through case review and discussion, while honoring the needs, desires and concerns of the various victims we served.

—Plymouth State University Police Department, New Hampshire

The data in Table 5 reflect the specific community agencies and organizations with which STOP subgrantees met on a weekly or monthly basis to address issues in 2009 and 2010.

Table 5. Community agencies/organizations with which subgrantees reported having weekly or monthly meetings in 2009 and 2010

Agency/organization	Average Subgrantees (N =2,285)	Percent
Domestic violence organization	1,115	49
Law enforcement	1,071	47
Prosecutor's office	904	40
Social service organization	759	33
Sexual assault organization	726	32
Court	715	31
Health/mental health organization	682	30

NOTE: Table reflects only the most frequently reported types of organizations with which STOP subgrantees had weekly or monthly contact.

Training

CCR participants have discovered that the policies and protocols developed as part of their coordinated response are most effective when participating agencies engage in training and cross-training. Such training creates a heightened awareness for staff members of the new policies and a better understanding of the reasons behind them, and establishes a strong endorsement of management for the changes. The training and cross-training address “best practices” that enable professionals to improve their response to victims/survivors, the roles and responsibilities of professionals and agencies, and the mandates of other institutions in the legal and community systems. Training expands substantive and procedural knowledge and offers the opportunity to improve skills.

The STOP Program, like most other OVW grant programs, supports the training of professionals to improve their response to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. The statutory purpose areas for the STOP Program specifically include the following:

- ▶ training for criminal justice personnel (i.e., law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and other court personnel), including those in specialized units;
- ▶ training of sexual assault forensic examiners
- ▶ training for victim advocates providing services to victims of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel

Funds for training may be distributed to organizations on the state or local level. In the following example, STOP Program funds were used to provide multidisciplinary training to rural agencies in Colorado:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The EAW [Ending Violence Against Women] Program has provided multidisciplinary training and technical assistance to rural communities that had limited access to these resources. Most of the rural agencies have very limited funds for training but they want someone with experience and credibility to come to their community to support their efforts. The STOP Program funding allows the EAW Project to provide them with quality training in their community that is accessible and affordable. The project has helped agencies to address the needs that have been identified as barriers to safety and accountability. Professionals from each discipline learn how to strengthen their skills and collaborate with the other agencies in their community. The project's team of 35 expert trainers, and a continually updated curriculum, coordinated by two staff members, is a valuable resource to professionals that has a lasting impact. This would not be possible without the STOP Program funding.

—*Colorado District Attorneys' Council*

A statewide legal immigration organization in Alaska used STOP Program funds to provide much-needed training to a range of professionals in remote areas throughout the state who were responding to the needs of immigrant victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has been critical to the provision of services to immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault victims. As the only agency in Alaska dedicated to providing comprehensive immigration legal services and the only agency with the expertise to provide legal services to immigrant domestic violence and sexual assault survivors/victims, our staff address the complex intersection of violence, limited English proficiency, and immigration status. Training of law enforcement, health care professionals, domestic violence and sexual assault program staff and judges is essential in order to provide protection and safety to domestic violence and sexual assault victims. STOP funding has allowed AIJP [Alaska Immigration Justice Project] staff to travel to remote communities in Alaska with large immigrant communities to train professionals working in these communities. Training has been instrumental in increasing outreach to immigrants residing in these communities. During this reporting period, AIJP's STOP-funded staff traveled to Petersburg, Cordova, Fairbanks, and Juneau, communities that are only accessible by plane or ferry, [and] where there are large numbers of immigrants working in canneries, hotels and restaurants.

—*Alaska Immigration Justice Project*

STOP Program funds in Wisconsin were used to send judges and county commissioners to national training on domestic violence and to provide in-state training to judicial officers and other court staff on domestic violence and sexual assault:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Because of STOP Program funding, we were able to send judges and a court commissioner to highly regarded and developed national trainings on domestic violence. These trainings provide curriculum unique to the court system and create an environment for judges and court commissioners to feel comfortable learning about and working through problem-solving strategies related to DV [domestic violence]. As a result of these national trainings, we have also been able to create judicial leadership related to these issues on a local level. We bring many of these training topics back to our state, and judges have been implementing many of the new ideas they learn at these workshops into their practices. The STOP funds have allowed our office to develop a formal “scholarship program” to send judges to training and hold them accountable for implementing training ideas upon their return. Without STOP funds, we would have not been able to offer the in-state training to judges, reserve judges, court commissioners, clerks of court, and their staff on domestic violence and sexual assault issues. In 2010, more than 330 Wisconsin court personnel benefited from this training thanks to STOP money.

—*Wisconsin Director of State Courts Office*

As first responders, law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping the victim/survivor safe and ensuring offender accountability. Ongoing training for law enforcement is essential, because of high rates of attrition, emerging knowledge about violence against women, and the fact that best practices develop and change over time.

An example of emerging knowledge is the finding that attempted strangulation is prevalent in domestic violence assaults. In a study of 300 attempted strangulation cases in San Diego, researchers found that most strangulation produces minor or no visible injuries, but many victims suffer internal injuries and experience trauma symptoms; that strangulation is gender-based (299 of 300 perpetrators were men), that most offenders do not use strangulation to kill but to demonstrate that they *can* kill, and that victims of prior attempted strangulations are at seven times greater risk of homicide than victims with no history of strangulation. For these reasons, training about strangulation is critical for police and prosecutors (Strack & Gwinn, 2011).

Another example of the need for training arose from mandatory arrest policies in some jurisdictions that resulted in dual arrests—for example, the arrests of both victims and batterers—and an increase in the number of women who were arrested. A New York City-based study looked at these and other unintended consequences of a mandatory arrest statute and found that “further training and better supervision is required for responding officers to better implement the requirement of the [mandatory arrest] law” (Frye, Haviland, & Rajah, 2007). To avoid inappropriate arrests of victims/survivors who have inflicted wounds on their violent partners in an attempt to protect themselves, a leading trainer on law

enforcement response to domestic violence (and former police officer) recommends that police officers receive training on defensive wounds. According to O'Dell, training to identify defensive wounds (such as bite wounds to the chest or arms) may result in a decrease in the number of victims/survivors who are illegally arrested (O'Dell, 2008).

Law enforcement officers as a group are the most frequent recipients of training provided with STOP Program dollars. The following are examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding has enabled the St. Louis County Police Department to increase the quantity and quality of investigations. The result from this increased funding is improved training for all officers and detectives, which has not only increased the department's ability to protect victims, but it has also assisted in the swift, successful issuance of warrants against perpetrators. The training of patrol officers has also improved the quality of initial reports that lead to warrants issued and the victim being protected.

—St. Louis County, Missouri

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funds allowed Spokane County Sheriff's Office personnel to attend the most recent and up-to-date training available. It is extremely valuable to have officers trained in the latest techniques so they are able to apply that knowledge to investigations. STOP funds allowed four crisis negotiators to attend an annual statewide training that included two case studies involving DV [domestic violence] situations that progressed into hostage situations and a case study that involved a prison scene with a female guard taken hostage and sexually assaulted. The DV team training allowed law enforcement to more effectively work side by side on the same floor with prosecutors and advocates and discuss cases face-to-face. The team setting allows law enforcement to tailor its response based on facts as they are made available to the various team members. The team training has led to a familiar working relationship among the team members, which has led to better outcomes for victims.

—Spokane County Sheriff's Office, Washington

STOP Program funds also support the training of health and mental health professionals. Research has documented the critical importance of training for healthcare providers on domestic violence (Thompson et al., 1998, 2000). These professionals are involved in the lives of victims/survivors at critical times; therefore, it is important that they understand domestic violence and sexual assault and provide appropriate treatment, support and referral to other services. Training also demonstrates how certain actions can be harmful to victims/survivors (e.g., engaging in marriage counseling with a controlling batterer and a victim, blaming the victim/survivor for her injuries, or recommending that the victim/survivor leave the batterer without understanding the dangers that may present). These professionals may not be aware of or recognize the tactics of intimidation and

manipulation employed by batterers or the increased danger victims/survivors face when attempting to leave or when newly separated from abusive partners (Fleury, Sullivan, & Bybee, 2000). Medical personnel who have not received specialized training may also inadvertently retraumatize rape and domestic violence victims.

Training health care providers in screening for and identifying domestic violence among their patients is a critical step in improving safety for victims/survivors. One study found that only 6 percent of physicians asked their patients about possible domestic violence, even though 88 percent of them knew that they had female patients who had experienced abuse (Elliott, Nerney, Jones, & Friedmann, 2002). Another study measuring the attitudes and values of 752 health providers before and after a 3-hour domestic violence training program found the following: after the training (including at the 6-month point), the providers reported feeling that they were better able to identify and assist victims/survivors, they were more comfortable making referrals, and they saw a greater role for themselves and the health care system in stopping domestic violence (Hamberger et al., 2004). This suggests that even a limited investment in training can yield significant results:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Project Shield has increased awareness and knowledge about the issue of sexual assault against persons with intellectual disabilities/developmental disabilities (ID/DD) among a wide variety of professionals. Police, prosecutors, social service workers, and medical professionals are critical to supporting a victim with ID/DD [who] discloses sexual assault. Project Shield places a concentrated effort on providing outreach and education to these professionals to identify signs of sexual abuse in persons with ID/DD, best practice techniques including communication tips for working with people with ID/DD and other issues related to consent to the forensic exam and guardianship.

—Kings County District Attorney's Office —Project Shield, New York

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

As part of the Seton Hill University initiatives in the STOP grant, Blackburn Center staff began the first round of faculty and university staff training on appropriate response to students who disclose dating violence and/or sexual assault. In addition, Blackburn Center staff provided training to physician assistant students at Seton Hill University on the healthcare response to domestic, sexual and dating violence victims and the importance of screening for abuse. Blackburn Center staff also provided domestic and sexual violence training to criminal justice students who will begin internships and activities in the near future working with domestic and sexual violence victims in the criminal justice system.

—Westmoreland County Commissioners, Pennsylvania

Payne and Triplett (2009) found that although social workers, particularly benefits workers, are in a position to respond to the needs of victims of domestic violence,

few are trained to do so. The same study also found that benefits workers are less likely than other social workers to attend training on domestic violence and are less likely to screen clients for domestic violence. Although domestic violence occurs at all socioeconomic levels, some research suggests that the prevalence rates are higher among those who live in poverty (Tolman & Raphael, 2000). Thus, many women seeking some form of public benefits also may be victims of domestic violence. Benefits workers, then, are especially well positioned to identify domestic violence victims and provide them with appropriate assistance and referrals to services.

Policies mandating training for benefits workers and screening of benefits clients would help ensure that the social welfare system does not overlook these victims. The connection between training and policy is important. Research suggests that human services agencies with policies mandating training have a higher rate of participation in training compared with agencies with no such policy (Payne, Carmody, Plichta, & Vandecar-Burdin, 2007). As these researchers suggest, “Developing policies that encourage participation in domestic violence training programs sends a message that these cases are important to agencies as well as public officials.”

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

With STOP funding, community education and outreach . . . is provided to agencies that come in direct contact with victims (i.e., law enforcement agencies, Department of Social Services/Child Protective Services, mental health centers, etc.). This collaboration and training with other agencies has been beneficial by encouraging more referrals to our program, increasing knowledge and understanding of domestic violence, lowering the incidence of re-victimization, and empowering victims to make informed decisions regarding their own safety.

—*Lewis County Opportunities, Inc., New York*

Given what is known about the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse, it is also important that child protective services (CPS) workers be trained on domestic violence. In a study examining the domestic violence training needs of CPS workers and strategies for delivering the training, Button and Payne (2009) identified the following specific areas of need: communicating warning signs about the potential for an abuser to become lethal, intervening with offenders, keeping CPS workers safe, understanding the needs of elder abuse victims, dealing with critical mental health issues, and managing the frustrations that arise when working on cases involving domestic violence (Button & Payne, 2009).

Table 6. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010—selected professional positions

Position	People trained 2009 (N =254,860)		People trained 2010 (N =235,593)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Law enforcement officers	78,987	31.0	69,670	29.6
Victim advocates(governmental and nongovernmental)	29,798	13.3	25,463	10.8
Health/mental health professionals	22,758	8.9	21,352	9.1
Social service organization staff	10,539	4.1	8,227	3.5
Educators	10,039	3.9	9,580	4.1
Court personnel	9,241	3.6	9,275	3.9
Attorneys/law students/legal services staff	6,285	2.5	6,291	2.7
Faith-based organization staff	6,204	2.4	3,827	1.6
Corrections personnel	5,997	2.4	5,175	2.2
Government agency staff	5,108	2.0	7,776	3.3
Prosecutors	4,897	1.9	6,834	2.9

NOTE: A number of categories above combine professional categories from the STOP Program subgrantee reporting form: health/mental health professionals combines the two reported categories of health and mental health professionals; victim advocates combines governmental and nongovernmental victim advocates and victim assistants; nongovernmental advocacy staff combines staff from advocacy, disability, elder, and immigrant organizations; and attorneys/law students/legal services staff combines the categories attorneys/law students and legal services staff. For a complete listing of all individual categories of people trained as they appear on the reporting form, see Table 11.

After victim services, training is the most frequent STOP Program-funded activity engaged in by subgrantees; an average of 977 subgrantees (43 percent) used their STOP Program funds to provide training in each reporting period. A total of 490,453 professionals were trained with STOP Program funds during the 2 years covered by this report. Nearly a third (30 percent) of those trained were law enforcement officers. Victim advocates (governmental and nongovernmental) made up the second largest category²⁶ with 11 percent of those trained, and health/ mental health professionals was the third largest category of professionals trained in 2009 and 2010.

²⁶ The category “multidisciplinary” technically had the second-highest number of people reported as trained; this category is chosen when subgrantees do not know the specific professions of people who received training, but do know that they are professionals serving or responding to victims/survivors.

Victim Services

Services for victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking were the most frequently funded activities under the STOP Program. The authorizing statute allows for the following victim services activities to be conducted with STOP Program funds:

- ▶ developing or improving victim services for underserved populations
- ▶ developing, enlarging, or strengthening victim services programs, including those that address the needs and circumstances of older and disabled women who are victims/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault
- ▶ providing assistance to victims/survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault in immigration matters
- ▶ maintaining core victim services while supporting emergency services for victims/survivors and their families
- ▶ funding supportive services and advocacy for victims/survivors of domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel

Providing services to victims/survivors and families is a major method for creating safety and security. Victims/survivors and families struggle with the physical, emotional, and financial implications of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and child sexual abuse. To address the complex needs of victims/survivors and families, advocates and community members work diligently to create responsive programs and services. These services include crisis intervention, emergency assistance (e.g., clothing, food, medical care, and housing), victim/survivor advocacy, criminal justice advocacy, civil legal advocacy, counseling and support, victim-witness notification, medical response, language lines, hotline services, transportation, and referrals to community resources and agencies. In the U.S. alone, there are an estimated 1,900 domestic violence programs providing these types of services; most victims/survivors initially engage with support groups, support services, counseling, legal advocacy, and shelters (Lyon, Bradshaw, & Menard, 2011).

Macy, Nurius, Kernic, and Holt (2005) found that more than a third (38 percent) of women in their study sought assistance from community-based domestic violence and sexual assault agencies within one month of a partner assault. A more recent study on nonresidential services by Lyon et al. (2011) found that of 1,401 respondents, more than half (56.4 percent) had used a domestic violence program more than 4 times in the past year and nearly 30 percent used services more than 20 times.

Victims/survivors need help finding services needed to support survival and end the abuse (Postmus, Severson, Berry, & Yoo, 2009). The types of services sought may evolve over time as the needs of victims change (Coker, Derrick, Lumpkin, Aldrich, & Oldendick, 2000). For example, services to assist victims with financial challenges are a critical component of victim assistance and advocacy. Access to money (e.g., income, spousal support, Temporary Aid to Needy Families [TANF], and other

government benefits) and economic self-sufficiency are critical to victim/survivor independence from perpetrators (Allstate Foundation, 2006).

Studies also reveal that victims who receive comprehensive advocacy and services are better able to meet their needs and achieve goals of safety, autonomy, healing, and economic security than women not receiving such support and services (Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004). More than 90 percent of the respondents in the Lyon et al. (2011) study reported that, as a result of the services they received, they were “more hopeful about the future” (95 percent) and they knew “more ways to plan for safety” (95 percent) and “more about rights and options” (93 percent).

Services provided to a victim whose case is being prosecuted may influence that victim’s willingness to participate in the criminal process. A study in a specialized municipal court of 384 domestic violence cases found that a victim’s cooperation after arrest, when combined with services by a court advocate, strongly predicted the victim’s cooperation at the point of a case’s disposition (Camacho & Alarid, 2008).

STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of 452,893 victims/survivors during each reporting period. Of those, 85.4 percent were victims of domestic violence, 12.3 percent were victims of sexual assault, and 2.3 percent were victims of stalking.²⁷ These victims/survivors received a wide range of services, including victim/survivor advocacy (assistance with obtaining services or resources, including material goods and services, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), hotline calls, crisis intervention, legal advocacy (assistance in navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems), counseling and support, and victim-witness notification. Subgrantees providing these services also routinely provided safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

²⁷ The overall number of victims/survivors served represents an unduplicated count; this means that each victim/survivor is counted only once by each subgrantee, regardless of the number of times that victim/survivor received services during each calendar year. Because victims/survivors can only be counted once, they must be reported under only one primary victimization. It is not uncommon for victims/survivors to experience more than one type of victimization (e.g., domestic violence and stalking, or domestic violence and sexual assault), but that fact is not reflected in the reported percentages of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking victims/survivors served.

Table 7. Victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services in 2009 and 2010

Type of service	2009	2010
	Victims/survivors served	Victims/survivors served
Victim advocacy ²⁸	215,088	206,486
Crisis intervention	211,182	193,327
Criminal justice advocacy	158,060	139,512
Civil legal advocacy ²⁹	130,056	113,854
Counseling/support group	115,725	106,067
Civil legal assistance ³⁰	25,273	24,401

NOTES: Each victim/survivor is reported only once in each category of service, regardless of the number of times that service was provided to the victim/survivor during the reporting period. Only the most frequently reported categories are presented; for a complete listing of categories of services provided to victims/survivors, see Table 24.

Victim advocates and others providing STOP Program-funded services to victims/survivors may be located in a nongovernmental, community-based agency; law enforcement agency; prosecutor's office; court; governmental agency; or medical or treatment facility. Below are some examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

There is a significant correlation between the presence of a domestic violence court advocate and positive outcomes of the protection from abuse process for victims of domestic violence, in that the presence of a legal advocate increases the likelihood of conditions being granted to protect the victim from further abuse. Project P.O.S.S.E. [Protection Order Support Services Evaluation] encourages advocate contact with plaintiffs prior to court hearings, in order to provide information about all legal options. Every victim with whom FVP [the Family Violence Project] interacts, whether court or self-referred, or contacted by us through information on the preliminary order, receives an explanation of court and protection order procedures, family court information and assistance, and someone to sit with and answer questions during court.

—*Family Violence Project, Maine*

²⁸ This number represents advocacy provided to victims/survivors by both governmental and nongovernmental advocates. For the purposes of reporting victim services activities provided by STOP subgrantees, advocacy provided by victim assistants or advocates located in governmental agencies are considered victim services; however, these victim services activities may also be considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for law enforcement, prosecution, and state and local courts as reported by STOP administrators, and are not considered to fulfill the statutorily mandated percentage allocations for victim services, which refers to nonprofit victim services only. See page 2.

²⁹ Civil legal advocacy" is providing assistance to victims/survivors with civil legal issues and is generally provided by a victim advocate or legal advocate.

³⁰ "Civil legal assistance" is the provision of civil legal services by an attorney and/or paralegal.

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has partially funded a full-time staff attorney dedicated to meeting the needs of immigrant victims of domestic violence and crime. We have increased the availability of services, information and training to victims as well as to shelter services, domestic violence organizations, mental health providers, prosecutors, public defenders, law guardians and court personnel. Domestic violence programming has become an integral part of the work that we do with undocumented immigrants. We have created a space in New Jersey for domestic violence professionals to find answers to questions on complicated immigration issues and a responsive referral source for victims to obtain quality legal consultations and representation where needed.

—American Friends Service Committee, New Jersey

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has allowed us to provide coordination of the domestic violence specialists (DVS) who are co-located at child protection offices to offer support to battered women and their children. DVSs provide consultation to the Child Protection Service workers (CPSW) on domestic violence-specific issues that can impact families. Battered women are offered ongoing support throughout the life of the child protection case. DVSs are also trained in batterer accountability and are able to support CPSWs in holding batterers accountable during the child protection process.

—New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding has enabled the office of the sheriff to provide a DV [domestic violence] intake specialist to victims of domestic violence who present [themselves] outside of regular business hours. Domestic violence incidents are not restricted to Monday–Friday business hours and neither should services available to victims. The DV intake specialist has provided a significant amount of support to victims that has resulted in a more positive experience with the criminal justice system for victims as well as exceptional multiagency collaboration. The DV intake specialist has been able to fill a gap in service to victims that had previously been recognized in the Lexington-Fayette County community. Victims receive exceptional one-on-one contact with grant-funded staff which enables our staff to provide continued communication with victims. Grant-funded staff have been able to assist victims with the process of the criminal justice system, with necessary transportation to/from court as needed, and with proper referrals for resources that are necessary to the victim. By working so closely with victims, our grant-funded staff are able to provide direct information to victims as offenders are served with emergency protection orders, which directly increases the safety of the victim and her family.

—Office of the Fayette County Sheriff, Kentucky

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has enabled Safe Horizon to provide specialized crisis intervention, counseling and advocacy to victims of domestic violence representing underserved populations, particularly victims who are immigrants and victims with limited English proficiency. Language and cultural differences can be barriers to service and make it difficult for the victim to convey the extent of the violence and its impact. With STOP Program funding, case managers have helped victims to navigate complex systems and communicate their needs. Staff has provided culturally sensitive services to victims from countries as diverse as Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Italy, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Honduras, China, Korea, the Philippines, and Nigeria. The family court case manager drafted a total of 155 family offense petitions on behalf of victims, clearly delineating the past violence and present threat, including high risk indicators and aggravating circumstances. These petitions have resulted in strong and effective court orders. In addition, the case manager provided 34 victims with immediate practical support such as transportation, clothing, and emergency financial assistance.

—*Safe Horizon, Inc., New York*

Other agencies concentrate on providing confidential services to victims/survivors who have substance abuse issues:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Program continues to provide a vital network of support and resources for women with co-occurring domestic violence and substance abuse. The AOD specialist has cultivated valuable relationships with substance abuse prevention and treatment providers, especially in Holyoke and Springfield [Massachusetts]. The presence of the AOD specialist and the strict attention to confidentiality have increased the number of disclosures about past and present AOD issues. This enables the AOD specialist and the victim to develop more effective safety plans and identify resources before use or relapse occurs.

—*Womenshelter/Companeras, Massachusetts*

Underserved Populations

Violence against women affects all populations in all areas of the United States, but some groups are more vulnerable and experience higher rates of violence than others (Field & Caetano, 2004). These population groups include American Indians/Alaska Natives, women living in rural areas, older adults, women who are disabled, children and youth, people who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; people of color and other racial minorities, and immigrants and refugees. Victims/survivors from these populations often face unique challenges and barriers to receiving assistance and support. Further, how these victims perceive and manage their experiences with violence may often reflect cultural and social norms,

opportunities, and restrictions (D. W. Campbell, Sharps, Gary, Campbell, & Lopez, 2002).

VAWA and OVW require states to specify in their implementation planning process how they will use STOP funds to address the needs of underserved victims/survivors. The statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program include specific references to the delivery of services to underserved populations,³¹ addressing the needs of American Indian tribes, addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors, and assisting victims/survivors in immigration matters. In addition, VAWA 2005 included a new mandate that at least 10 percent of the funds awarded by states to fulfill the 30 percent requirement to victim services be awarded to culturally-specific, community-based organizations.³²

The following are examples of how administrators and a coalition have attempted to meet the needs of diverse populations in their states:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Every effort is made to address the needs of underserved populations; recognition for the need has been established for years. Our projects are carried out with language and cultural sensitivities in mind. Guam's multiethnic population is represented by the diverse staff composition in each of Guam's STOP project service providers. In addition to specific staffing diversity, our outreach awareness and service information brochures are printed in various languages: Chamorro, Filipino, Palauan, Chuukese, and English. Radio and television awareness ads, public service announcements, and information campaigns are also conducted with diverse/underserved representatives speaking their own native languages.

—STOP administrator, Guam

³¹ VAWA 2005 at Section 40002 (a)(32) defines “underserved populations” as including “populations underserved because of geographic location, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alienage status, or age), and any other population determined to be underserved by the Attorney General or by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate.”

³² 42 U.S.C. 3796gg-1(c)(3)(B)

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Ten percent of the victims services allocation supports services for victims of sexual and domestic violence in three culturally-specific, community-based agencies. Three additional initiatives that provide culturally-specific services are supported in mainstream domestic violence programs and sexual assault crisis centers. These agencies have employed bilingual, bicultural staff to assist women who speak Spanish. Furthermore, roughly 50 percent of the funding allocated to subgrantees supports the apprehension, prosecution, and adjudication of violent crimes against women in Virginia's rural localities. This funding makes a particularly significant impact in the resource-deprived, isolated regions of the commonwealth where cultural norms around intimate partner and sexual violence have not progressed as far as in other regions of Virginia. Prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and advocates in these rural localities are making serious progress in developing protocols and conducting training on the identification of predominant aggressor, the criminal justice system response to sexual and domestic violence, and stalking, as well as serving victims who are tremendously physically, as well as emotionally, isolated.

—*STOP administrator, Virginia*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funds have enabled IowaCASA (Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault) to provide services to several underserved communities—Latino/a, African, and Muslim. IowaCASA's legal assistant is bilingual with her primary language being Spanish. In addition, the STOP funds allowed us to contract with two individuals who provide groups and individual counseling in the African and Muslim communities. This group in particular has fewer options for resources within the community; so having dedicated people to provide victim services and outreach has helped immensely.

—*Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault*

Of all subgrantees providing services in calendar years 2009 and 2010, 99 percent provided services to victims/survivors in at least one of the underserved categories.³³ Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to provide services to an annual average of 9,169 victims/survivors who were reported in the category American Indian and Alaska Native; 94,274 victims/survivors who were black or African-American; 75,897 victims/survivors who were Hispanic or Latino; 6,304 victims/survivors who were Asian; 15,807 victims/survivors who were 60 years of age or older; 24,818 victims/survivors with disabilities; 38,975 victims/survivors with

³³ It is not possible to report the overall percentage of victims/survivors receiving services who were from one or more of the underserved populations because victim data were reported in the aggregate and individual victims/survivors may be reported in a number of the underserved categories. "Underserved" categories referred to here include the following: people of races and ethnicities other than white (in categories established by the Office of Management and Budget), individuals more than 60 years old, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, immigrants or refugees, and those living in rural areas.

limited English proficiency; 21,477 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; and 118,878 victims/survivors living in rural areas.³⁴

In addition to providing direct services, subgrantees used STOP Program funds for training, products (such as brochures, manuals, training curriculums, and training materials), and the development and implementation of policies addressing issues specific to the needs of underserved victims/survivors. Training was provided to a total of 7,736 staff members of advocacy organizations for older, disabled, and immigrant populations. These nongovernmental, community-based groups are often in the best position to reach specific underserved populations and to assist them with referrals to appropriate services and agencies.

Training on issues specific to underserved populations was provided by an average of 724 subgrantees—74 percent of subgrantees that reported using STOP funds for training. Similarly, an average of 257 subgrantees—57 percent of subgrantees using STOP funds for policy development—established and/or implemented policies regarding appropriate responses to underserved populations in victim services, the criminal justice system, and health care. Taken together, the use of STOP Program funds in these areas demonstrates the commitment of states and subgrantees to better understand the particular challenges faced by victims/survivors in underserved populations and to improve responses to the needs of these victims.

American Indians and Alaska Natives

American Indian and Alaska Native women report higher rates of victimization than women from any other ethnic or racial background (Black et al., 2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) revealed that rates of domestic violence varied significantly by race; rates among American Indian women are much higher (45.9 percent) than rates among African-American (40.9 percent), Hispanic (35.2 percent) and white women (31.7 percent) (Black et al., 2011). However, accurate lifetime prevalence rates in American Indian groups do not currently exist (Chester, Robin, Koss, Lopez, & Goldman, 1994; Evans-Campbell, Lindhorst, Huang, & Walters, 2006; Jones, 2007).³⁵

In a study conducted of 1,368 American Indian women from 6 tribal nations, nearly half reported physical assault and 80 percent of those said the assault had been committed by an intimate partner (Yuan, Koss, Polacca, & Goldman, 2006). A survey of American Indian women between the ages of 18 and 77 found that 65 percent

³⁴ For more detailed demographic information on victims/survivors served by all states, see Table 22; for demographic information on victims/survivors served by individual states see Tables B3a, B3b, B4a and B4b in Appendix B.

³⁵ In an effort to address this gap, VAWA 2005 called for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to conduct "a national baseline study to examine violence against Indian women in Indian country." In consultation with OVW, NIJ is implementing a new research program that will collect information on violence against Indian women in Indian country and in Alaska Native communities focusing on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and murder. For more information regarding the status of this research, see the 2012 *Biennial Report*, section on American Indians and Alaska Natives.

had experienced some form of interpersonal violence, with 40 percent reporting a history of domestic violence (Evans-Campbell et al., 2006). A survey mirroring the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey, administered to Athabaskan women in Alaska, found that nearly two-thirds had experienced domestic violence at some point in their adult life (Wood & Magen, 2009).

As startling as the rates of domestic violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women are, the rates of sexual abuse are even more startling and are reported to be the highest in the nation (Luna-Firebaugh, 2006). According to data from the NISVS, more than a quarter of women who self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native reported being raped at some point in their lives (Black et al., 2011). The NVAW Survey found that 65 percent of American Indian women reported experiencing rape or physical violence, a rate 2 times that of African-Americans, 2.5 times that of whites, and 4.5 times that of Asian Americans. American Indian and Alaska Native women are also more likely to suffer physical injuries in addition to the sexual assault (50 percent) when compared with non-Native women (30 percent) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). Revictimization rates are also considerably higher among American Indian and Alaska Native women when compared with non-Native women (Saylor & Daliparthi, 2006; Ullman, Najdowski, & Filipas, 2009).

Complicating efforts to protect these victims/survivors is the fact that many live in isolated communities and may not have access to telephones, transportation, or emergency services. Also, criminal justice resources and legal assistance often are limited in those communities.

STOP Program funds have been used to train tribal law enforcement and tribal prosecution staffs, for outreach to Native victims/survivors and families, and to provide court advocacy for Native victims, as described in the following examples:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Law enforcement dollars will provide training for village public safety and village police officers in rural communities and some of prosecution's funding is designated specifically for training rural paralegal/witness coordinators and rural prosecutors. Additionally, the Council funded the tribal government of St. Paul Island to assist in providing services to Aleut Tribal member victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. St. Paul Island is an isolated, rural community located in the middle of the Bering Sea, 300 miles from the Alaska mainland and 600 miles from Anchorage, the closest urban hub.

—STOP administrator, Alaska

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP Program funding has made it possible to meet the continuously growing need for domestic violence services for Native American victims and their children. This [staff] position has allowed us to educate and bring awareness about domestic violence in the Native American cultures through presentations, publications, and increased advocacy . . . specifically to Native American victims and their families. Additionally, tribal and district court processes for victims are not as intimidating now that an advocate is readily available to help the victim from the initial filing of documents through the final hearings. As a result of court advocacy, a primary Native American cultural barrier (keeping family issues in the family) is showing an extraordinary stride towards accountability and justice for abusers. The events mentioned above are improving community and agency responses to Native American victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

—Okmulgee County Family Resource Center, Inc, Oklahoma

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The Fremont County Alliance [Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault] provides services to all victims who access our services, and this includes services to residents who reside on the Wind River Reservation, which covers a significant portion of Fremont County. The program provides our Native American clients with assistance in filing for protection orders through the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court, as well as the Riverton and Lander Circuit courts (if they live off the reservation), enabling clients to be provided with the protection that best fits their needs. The program staff have developed an excellent working relationship with the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court judges and clerks, and work closely with the court in facilitating services for victims residing on the reservation. Two of our staff members are currently taking the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribal Court Advocacy training, which will enable them to represent clients in Tribal Court on matters such as divorce and child custody when they pass the court advocate test.

—Fremont County Alliance Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Wyoming

An average of 15 subgrantees receiving STOP Program funding in 2009 and 2010 identified themselves as tribal sexual assault and/or domestic violence programs, tribal coalitions or tribal governments.³⁶ An average of 59 subgrantees reported that their projects specifically addressed tribal populations and cited nearly 211 unique nations, tribes, and bands they served or intended to serve. American Indian or Alaska Native individuals comprised 2.2 percent of those served with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010, with 18,337 victims/survivors receiving services. Training on issues specific to American Indian/Alaska Native victims/survivors was provided by

³⁶ The Grants to Tribal Governments Program provides funding to tribal governments and agencies and is separate from the STOP Program. Activities supported by that grant program are reported on in the 2010 and 2012 Biennial Reports.

an average of 137 subgrantees, and 684 tribal government and tribal agency staff were trained with STOP funds during 2009 and 2010.

Victims/survivors with Disabilities and Older Victims/survivors

Over 306 million Americans live with a wide array of physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2011).³⁷ Of these, between 2 and 4 people in 1,000 are functionally D/deaf, with about 1 person in 1,000 becoming deaf before he or she is 18 years old. Some people who are D/deaf or hard of hearing do not consider themselves a “person with a disability or limitation” but rather identify as a member of a cultural or linguistic group (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2009).

The violence and abuse of women with disabilities and D/deaf women may be more severe, of longer duration, inflicted by multiple perpetrators, and occur in settings unlike those of other victims/survivors (e.g., group homes, hospitals, and institutions). Also, women with disabilities and D/deaf women frequently have greater challenges accessing the legal system, advocacy, services, and community support than other victims/survivors (Nosek & Hughes, 2006).

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey of 356,112 men and women revealed that, compared with all other populations, women with disabilities were nearly 3 times more likely to be threatened by violence, 2.5 times more likely to be physically abused, and more than 12 times more likely to experience unwanted sex (D. L. Smith, 2008). According to the Committee on Law and Justice (2001), studies show prevalence rates from 39 to 85 percent of women with disabilities who experience some type of physical or emotional abuse at the hands of an intimate partner or caregiver. A study of 5,326 women revealed that the 26 percent of women who reported having some type of disability were more than 4 times more likely to have been sexually assaulted within the past year than women without disabilities (Martin et al., 2006).

Victims with disabilities may also be subject to types of abuse that are less likely to be issues for nondisabled women, such as the denying or delaying medications; withholding food, heat, or assistance; and preventing the use of necessary assistive devices (Radford, Harne, & Trotter, 2006). Significant economic consequences also have been noted in the research. For example, in a study of 200 disabled women, 30 percent said the interpersonal violence interfered with their ability to maintain employment, and slightly more than 60 percent reported that the violence kept them from living independently (Powers et al., 2002).

³⁷ Disability is defined as something that occurs outside of the person based on the interaction of the person, his or her functional abilities, and the environment. There are specific categories of functional disabilities: balance, cognitive functions, dimensional extremes, mental health, movement and mobility, respiratory functions, sensory functions, voice/speech and language, stamina, and fatigue. VERA's Accessing Safety Project. "Understanding Disability: <http://www.accessingsafety.org/index.php/>.

Women with disabilities face additional barriers that may seriously interfere with their ability to leave a violent relationship. These barriers include being dependent on their perpetrator for caregiver assistance, an inability to exit the house, loss of caregiver service, the replacement cost of assistive structures/devices that are not portable, inadequate transportation, limited sign language skills of criminal justice personnel or lack of instructions in Braille for pro se litigants, inaccessible emergency shelters or court buildings, the risk of retaliatory or involuntary institutionalization by their abuser, and the loss of resources provided by the abusive partner or other family members (Copel, 2006; Curry et al., 2009).

In the following example, a woman with disabilities was assisted by a skilled advocate in a criminal case that resulted in a positive outcome for the victim/survivor:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our advocate has been able to spend time with victims and address their needs. She has the time to do in-depth personal assessments of victims and can help them prepare for testimony. She is also able to discuss her assessment with the prosecutor. In our case with the homeless victim who had learning problems our victim advocate correctly assessed that she had problems communicating and remembering the events in sequential order. This is common with learning disabilities and also with PTSD [post-traumatic stress disorder] sufferers. This assessment and communication with the prosecutor allowed the prosecutor to introduce evidence of her problems and present to the jury the valid reasons why her testimony was inconsistent. With this knowledge, the jury had no problems convicting him [the defendant] of all counts.

—Sacramento County District Attorney's Office, California

A New Mexico subgrantee reported using STOP funds to provide interpreter services for victims/survivors who are D/deaf and hard of hearing :

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The provision of interpreter services for D/deaf and hard-of-hearing survivors creates access to domestic and sexual violence services where previously there may have been none. It is also true that after receiving training, a number of DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] providers report that they were sought for services by someone from the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing community. Providers also reported feeling that they felt more adequately prepared to effectively serve D/deaf and hard-of-hearing survivors

—Rape Crisis Center of Central New Mexico

Older women also experience intimate partner violence. In their study conducted for the National Center on Elder Abuse, Otto and Quinn (2007) found that 20 percent of the reports of abuse against victims older than 60 were the result of

domestic violence. It is estimated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging (2007), that approximately a half-million older adults experience some form of domestic violence.

Only a handful of studies have been conducted examining the experience of older women with intimate partner violence. This is because older victims do not typically receive services through the same service system as younger victims. The two main systems responding to older victims of intimate partner violence are adult protective services (APS) and domestic violence agencies (Kilbane & Spira, 2010; Lundy & Grossman, 2009). Each system operates from different sets of assumptions and models of service delivery. Workers in each system are trained differently in terms of theoretical and conceptual understandings and best practices for service, which results in fundamental differences in planning for safety and protection and in reporting incidents (Kilbane & Spira, 2010). Often women in later life are encouraged to seek and/or are referred to obtain assistance from APS (Paranjape, Tucker, Mckenzie-Mack, Thompson, & Kaslow, 2007). However, once a woman is within the APS system, it is highly unlikely that she will be referred to domestic violence programs for appropriate services or that the incidents will be reported to law enforcement (Otto & Quinn, 2007). Perhaps more problematic is the possibility that the APS investigative process—including unannounced home visits, and contact with family members complicit in abuse by a caretaker or partner—could trigger additional acts of violence, because of APS workers' lack of training in the risks of intimate partner violence (Kilbane & Spira, 2010).

An additional complication is that, historically, many domestic violence and sexual assault agencies have overlooked older women. It is often assumed that sexual assault happens only to “younger women.” Doctors, caretakers, friends, and family members may overlook sexual assault and fail to appropriately screen for it (I. Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Providers may not recognize the signs of violence in an older relationship as quickly as they might in a younger couple (Beaulaurier, Seff, Newman, & Dunlop, 2007). In one study, only 3 percent of older women indicated having ever been asked about physical or sexual violence by their health care provider (Bonomi et al., 2007).

Older women often have distinct and special needs: few are employed and most are receiving public assistance or Social Security benefits or are dependent on family members for their care (Lundy & Grossman, 2009). For many, the length of their relationships can be a complicating factor. Women who have been married for 25 or more years may feel their options are more limited (Leisey, Kupstas, & Cooper, 2009). Given these differences, it is vital that sexual assault and domestic violence agencies create a response that is specific to the needs and situations of older victims/survivors and that these agencies work with community justice and social services agencies to improve their communities' overall response to victims/survivors who are older. The following are examples, both in Pennsylvania, of how subgrantees used STOP Program funding to benefit older victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The effectiveness of the program can best be seen in the coordination of services that resulted. Because of STOP grant funding, our medical advocate was able to link elderly victims to the Senior Adult Activity Center (SAAC) and our legal advocacy project to secure transportation and financial compensation. An advocate from SAAC was able to accompany victims to the courthouse and remain with them during those periods when our legal advocates were working with other victims. Resources were coordinated in cases where an elderly victim needed property repairs (such as replacement locks) or temporary housing. More important than the increase in victims served, we believe, was the heightened sensitivity and awareness of the special needs of these victims that developed in both the advocates' work and the court response.

—*Women's Center of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The Domestic Violence Service Center in Luzerne County engaged in a collaborative effort to identify and serve elderly victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in their county. The project trained outreach staff from several agencies that have contact with socially isolated elders or elders that are homebound. Additionally, discussion groups were held with elder populations at six senior centers. The success of the training was verified by a 133 percent increase in agency cross system contacts. Also, there was a 32 percent increase in hotline calls and a 21-percent increase in new victims served who are over 60.

— *STOP administrator, Pennsylvania*

Because of the unique challenges and barriers faced by victims/survivors with disabilities and victims/survivors who are older, it is critical to direct funding to programs that will focus on responding to their needs, as the STOP Program does. An annual average of 212 (9 percent) of all subgrantees reported that their programs assisted criminal justice agencies and others in addressing the needs of older and disabled victims/survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault. Overall, STOP subgrantees reported providing victim services to an average of 24,818 victims/survivors with disabilities and 15,807 victims/survivors over the age of 60—5.5 percent and 3.8 percent, respectively, of all victims served.³⁸ STOP Program subgrantees provided training and developed or implemented policies designed to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of the criminal justice system's response and the provision of services to older and disabled victims/survivors. Training that addressed issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by an average of 402 subgrantees to other professionals; subgrantees also provided

³⁸ Because data are collected at the program level and not at the victim level, it is not known how many of these victims/survivors were both disabled and older than 60. Also, the reporting form that was used to collect data for this report used the category 60+. The next lowest category was ages 25–59.

training to 6,066 staff members of disability and elder advocacy organizations. Policies addressing the needs of victims/survivors who are elderly or who have disabilities were developed or implemented by an average of 160 subgrantees in each reporting year.

Victims/survivors Who Are Immigrants or Refugees

Language barriers, isolation, immigration status, and traditional values increase the vulnerability of immigrant women and intensify their need to rely significantly on their abusers (Bhuyan, Mell, Senturia, Sullivan, & Shiu-Thornton, 2005). Lack of education and job skills necessary for working in the United States may deepen that isolation and dependency. Tactics used by batterers to isolate victims/survivors can include not allowing them to learn English, go to school, gain employment, or communicate with friends and family (Erez, Adelman, & Gregory, 2008). Language barriers, cultural values, religious convictions, economic dependence, lack of education, and a lack of knowledge of the legal system are among the major obstacles these women may confront when seeking justice and trying to escape the violence in their intimate relationships (Vidales, 2010).

Women refugees arrive from home countries where they may have been victims of war, genocide, gang rape by military personnel or combatants, starvation, religious persecution, stalking, or intimate partner violence (Ganeshpanchan, 2005; Runner, Yoshihama, & Novick, 2009). The violence they suffer may be state sponsored or culturally condoned, and may occur in situations of armed conflict, refugee camps, or detention facilities (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2009). Victimization by intimate partners, racist and faith-intolerant neighbors, detention personnel, and others is not uncommon for refugee women. Few service providers and legal system personnel have the knowledge and skills to assist these victims/survivors (Runner et al., 2009).

Immigrant women, especially those who are undocumented, may be afraid to seek help after being victimized. They may not know their rights or the services that are available to them. Of those who are aware, many are fearful of the stigma that may be associated with accessing services. Literature suggests that immigrant victims may prefer to tell friends or family members about the interpersonal violence they have experienced (Ingram, 2007; Yoshihama, Bybee, Dabby, & Blazevski, 2010).

Research suggests that domestic violence may be more severe among immigrant women than among U.S. citizens (M. Anderson, 1993; Raj & Silverman, 2002). Homicide data from New York City revealed that immigrant women were disproportionately represented among female victims of intimate partner homicides (Frye, Hoselin, Waltermaurer, Blaney, & Wilt, 2005); Washington State data on homicides from 1997 through 2009 revealed that nearly 20 percent (61 of 309) of domestic violence homicide victims were immigrants and refugees, although people born outside the United States made up only 12 percent of the state's population (Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2011).

Fear of deportation is a tremendous concern for some immigrant victims. Often, the batterer will exploit this fear and use threats of deportation to maintain control (Erez et al., 2008; Runner et al., 2009). Seventy-five percent of battered immigrant women interviewed in one study indicated that their abusers used their immigration status against them (Erez et al., 2008). Immigrant women are fearful not only of being deported themselves and losing their children, but worry about the potential for their husbands to be deported. The deportation of the battering husband often means the loss of economic resources, stability, and family ties. The woman may be left with feelings of guilt and suffer social and cultural stigmatization, increased isolation, economic instability, and loss of familial support if the abuser is deported.

Congress passed two measures of relief specifically for noncitizen victims: VAWA 2000 and VAWA 2005 improved on efforts made in VAWA 1994 to prevent an abusive citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse from using immigration law to keep an abused immigrant spouse from reporting the abuse or leaving the relationship; and VAWA 2000 established the U-visa for victims of certain serious crimes who lack lawful status in the United States and are willing to cooperate in the investigation or prosecution of those crimes. Among the crimes covered by the U-visa legislation are rape, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

The following is one subgrantee's description of the many challenges faced by victims/survivors who are immigrants and how STOP funds were used to respond to the needs of one victim:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

This year we began the VAWA visa process for two [Hispanic] victims. Without this funding, our program would not have had the bilingual staff or the time to assist in the visa process. The Hispanic woman who has been with us for over a year is the perfect example of the need for this project. She came to us severely beaten. We gave her shelter and filed for a protective order. Her American husband filed for divorce and custody of their son and attempted to have her deported. We found her an attorney at a reduced rate for the divorce and linked her with the Tulsa University Immigrant Rights Project to file for a VAWA visa. In this year the victim has obtained her divorce with joint custody of her son, has obtained her immigration papers including her work permit, filed her taxes, obtained a driver's license, and is now working in a bank. The Hispanic advocate was there every step of the way providing translation services, transportation, advocacy, and referrals.

—STOP administrator, Oklahoma

In the following examples, immigrant victims/survivors were assisted with culturally and linguistically appropriate counseling and legal advocacy:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our STOP funds allow us to provide counseling and immigration assistance to sexual assault and domestic violence survivors in a culturally- and linguistically-appropriate manner. This is the only program in the city of Detroit that provides culturally- and linguistically-appropriate advocacy and counseling to Latina survivors of domestic violence.

—*Community Health and Social Services Center, Inc., Michigan*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The Chinese Family Violence Awareness Project (CFVAP) increased the number of immigrant survivors who sought legal protection orders. Without the encouragement, assistance, and court accompaniment of the CFVAP advocate these clients would not have obtained their protection orders. The CFVAP advocate was able to explain the process in their own language and make it understandable to them.

—*Hawaii Immigrant Justice Center*

VAWA 2000 included a provision for assistance to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in immigration matters in the purpose areas of the STOP Program, authorizing recipients of these funds to address immigration issues on behalf of victims/survivors. Subgrantees reported serving an average of 21,577 victims/survivors who were immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers; these victims represent 5 percent of all victims/survivors served in 2009 and 2010. Training on issues specific to these victims/survivors was provided by an average of 281 subgrantees. This training is critical because the social, cultural, and legal issues these victims/survivors face are complex and the consequences of reporting their victimization are often more serious than for other victims/survivors.

Subgrantees also used STOP Program funds to provide language services designed to remove barriers to accessing critical services and effectively dealing with the criminal justice system. These services were provided by an average of 129 STOP Program subgrantees in each reporting period and included interpreters; language lines; and the translation of forms, documents, and informational materials into languages other than English. Subgrantees used STOP Program funds to develop, translate, and/or distribute 636 unique products in 27 different languages in 2009 and 2010.³⁹

Victims/survivors Who Live in Rural Areas

Rural women are at elevated risk for domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. A recent study of battered women attending a family planning clinic in the Midwest

³⁹ For a list of the languages in which these materials were developed or translated, see page 93, the Products section of “STOP Aggregate Accomplishments.”

revealed that women living in remote, isolated rural areas are at particular risk of domestic and sexual violence. In the year before the study, 61.5 percent of women living in remote rural areas were assaulted 4 or more times compared with 39.1 percent of women in urban areas, and the severity of abuse was 3 times greater for rural as compared with urban victims/survivors (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Separated and divorced rural women are raped/sexually assaulted at rates 1.6 times higher than separated suburban women and more than 3 times higher than their urban counterparts (Rennison, DeKeseredy, & Dragiewicz, 2012). Further, women in rural areas report higher levels of stalking and are more likely to be isolated from family or friends by their abusive partners (Logan, Evans, Stevenson, & Jordan, 2005). The percentage of homicides involving intimate partners is higher in rural areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006; Gallup-Black, 2005)

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey (2005) found that 26.7 percent of women and 15.5 percent of men living in rural areas reported experiencing physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime (Breiding, Ziembroski, & Black, 2009). A study of partner violence in rural health care clinics found that 13.3 percent of women reported they currently were experiencing IPV and 25.6 percent reported IPV in the past 5 years, with two-thirds revealing both assault and psychological battering (Coker et al., 2007).

Victims/survivors in rural communities often find that medical, legal, and social services are very limited or nonexistent (Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007; Grama, 2000; Logan, Walker, Cole, Ratliff, & Leukefeld, 2003). In addition, rural women must travel great distances to reach services: the distance to services is often three times greater for rural women than for their urban counterparts, with 25 percent traveling more than 40 miles to the closest program (Peek-Asa et al., 2011). Given the reduced availability of services for victims/survivors, the opportunity for building support networks through discussion and sharing experiences with other victims/survivors is frequently nonexistent (Eastman et al., 2007).

Compounding the lack of services is the complex interweaving of systemic, cultural, physical, psychological, and emotional barriers that may prevent women in rural and frontier areas from seeking assistance. Cultural factors such as patriarchal male peer support (DeKeseredy, Schwartz, Fagen, & Hall, 2006), a lack of anonymity, the fear of familial disapproval, and an ethic of self-reliance may prevent women from seeking safety (Eastman et al., 2007; Grama, 2000; Hunnicutt, 2007; Lee & Stevenson, 2006). In some rural communities, women attempting to leave a relationship report that the men who sexually assault them received support and reinforcement for their behavior from peers, and that many of these “supportive” men also were abusing their own partners (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2008).

Rural areas are often characterized by high unemployment levels, high poverty rates, limited services, and a lack of appropriate housing or shelter, all of which create obstacles to help seeking by victims/survivors (Eastman et al., 2007). Rural women are less likely to be insured than urban and suburban residents (Mueller & MacKinney, 2006; P. Patterson, 2006), thus restricting their access to physical and

mental health care services (Basile & Black, 2011). Geographic isolation, combined with inadequate transportation and a lack of telephone service, makes leaving a batterer, particularly in the midst of a crisis, nearly impossible for rural victims/survivors (Grama, 2000; Krishnan, Hilbert, & VanLeeuwen, 2001).

STOP funding helped provide a comprehensive array of services to rural victims/survivors that would not have been otherwise available. Below are some examples:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The village of Granville is located in a rural corner of Washington County near the Vermont border. Victim services are located about 35 miles away. Public transportation is nonexistent so without STOP funds and the relationships that the police department has built through the multidiscipline and coordinated response contacts, victims would have much fewer resources available to them. Domestic Violence Intervention Unit officers provide transportation, advocacy, referral, intervention, medical and court accompaniment and other assistance to victims that would not be possible without STOP funding. Victims find themselves with a resource through the assigned Domestic Violence Unit Officer that breaks down barriers that might otherwise exist for them.

—*Granville Police Department, Vermont*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has been, and remains, critical to our ability to truly provide victim-centered, empowerment-based advocacy and support services. The Shelter, Inc. primary service area includes five rural counties encompassing approximately 3,000 square miles. Without the direct service resources provided by STOP funding, victims/survivors would not have options for making choices for staying or leaving, obtaining PPO's [protective orders], accessing counseling, court accompaniment and countless other services based on individual choice and need.

—*Shelter, Inc., Michigan*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP program allows us to provide supervised visits and exchanges to women and their children affected by domestic violence or the threat of domestic violence. Our program is very important as it is the only program [that] provides visitation and exchange services in our county and in our surrounding counties in rural Appalachian Ohio. The ability to have a supervised exchange is very comforting to women who must provide their children for court-ordered visitation with their (the woman's) abuser.

—*Supervised Visitation Center, Ohio*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

This funding allows this office to assist victims at the onset of abuse and refer clients within Legal Aid for representation in other legal matters. These clients are screened for legal issues with housing, medical care, and consumer debt arising from the abusive relationship. The experience of our staff allows us to efficiently handle a large volume of cases with a high degree of success. We identify and resolve root causes of problems to help low income persons resume healthy, productive lives. Additionally, Legal Aid partners with hundreds of social service organizations, government entities, and private law firms to address client needs and ensure that we are not just putting a band-aid on serious issues.

—*Legal Aid of Western Missouri, "Rural Assistance Now"*

STOP Program funds were used to provide services to an average of 118,878 victims/survivors who were reported as residing in rural areas (including reservations and Indian country) per reporting period; this number represents more than a quarter (26 percent) of all victims/survivors served. Training in issues specific to victims/survivors who live in rural areas was provided by an average of 405 subgrantees (41 percent of those using funds for training).

The Criminal Justice Response

The authorizing statute for the STOP Program says STOP funds may be used to develop, train, or expand units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges and other court personnel who focus their efforts on violent crimes against women, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. These are usually referred to as specialized units in law enforcement and prosecution, and specialized domestic violence courts or dockets in the judicial system. An average of 532 STOP subgrantees (23 percent of all subgrantees) reported using funds to support specialized units in law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and probation or parole. The statute also authorizes funds to be used to develop and implement more effective police, court, and prosecution policies specifically addressing violent crimes against women. An average of 557 STOP subgrantees (24 percent) reported using funds for that purpose. Finally, funds may be used for data and communication systems that link police, prosecutors, and courts to assist them with identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions for violent crimes against women. STOP funds were used for that purpose by an average of 239 subgrantees (10 percent).

Law Enforcement

Law enforcement agencies are charged with identifying and arresting the perpetrators of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. VAWA also anticipates that law enforcement professionals will act to safeguard victims/survivors. The way officers and agencies carry out these duties profoundly influences their success or failure in responding to violence against women. Success

can be measured both by reduction in recidivism rates and by victim/survivor satisfaction with the assistance provided. One study found that for women experiencing intimate partner sexual assault, contact with the justice system, whether from police or a protection order, was associated with a reduction in the risk of reassault of up to 70 percent (McFarlane et al., 2005). Victims who find police contact to be positive are more likely to call police again should violence recur (Buzawa, Hotaling, Klein, & Byrne, 1999; Davis & Maxwell, 2002; Davis & Taylor, 1997; Friday, Lord, Exum, & Hartman, 2006).

Specialized Units

The availability of physical evidence is often crucial to the successful disposition of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases. Specialized police domestic violence units have been shown to collect valuable evidence in a much higher percentage of cases than traditional patrol units (Friday et al., 2006). The evidence collected by specialized units also is more likely to be useful for prosecution (Townsend, Hunt, Kuck, & Baxter, 2005) and lead to higher rates of prosecution, conviction, and sentencing (Jolin, Feyerherm, Fountain, & Friedman, 1998). Victims/survivors assisted by specialist domestic violence officers are more likely to engage in help-seeking and self-protection strategies than those not receiving specialized police intervention (Amendola, Slipka, Hamilton, & Whitman, 2010).

Specialized law enforcement units may consist of just one dedicated staff person, but still can have a significant impact on victim safety and offender accountability.

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP grant funding has allowed our community to have the benefit of a full time DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] investigator. Before this funding, victims were bounced from one officer to another when trying to obtain information about their case. With the DV/SA investigator, the victim can call one person and they will get the information needed about the case. This enables victims to feel they are more in control of the situation and makes them feel as if they can trust law enforcement again and will call again if needed. Without this funding we will have no choice but to return to the way it was with victims "chasing" their case through the system.

—Jefferson County Commissioners, Ohio

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

[T]he Nebraska State Patrol (NSP) has been able to coordinate an effective and consistent statewide response to domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. The [STOP-funded] Program manager works closely with 12 DV/SA [domestic violence/sexual assault] specialist troopers strategically located around the state. They provide information regarding issues in their communities and the program manager provides new and current information on DV/SA-related issues. The DV/SA specialists are the contacts for related cases in their area. They work with their local service providers and often represent NSP at community response team meetings, presentations, forums and awareness activities. Beyond the DV/SA specialists, the program manager provides all domestic violence-related training to new recruits as well as annual in-service training. This ensures that recruits and seasoned officers are getting appropriate and advanced training in this area. The program manager has provided technical assistance through expert witness testimony. Statewide, there are only three individuals who provide expert witness testimony in this area. An increased demand has been noticed in the area of expert witness testimony. The existence of the program manager has also allowed for the ongoing review of DV/SA-related policies and an internal commitment to reviewing these cases and addressing inconsistencies.

—*Nebraska State Patrol*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Since the beginning of STOP funding, this office has been able to provide victims and the community with a full-time officer dedicated solely to the demanding issue of domestic violence. As a result, cases are handled individually and properly and offenders are held more accountable. The Office of Domestic Violence Investigation has been able to more closely monitor the cases as they travel through the criminal justice system, ensuring the accuracy and completeness of incident reports, victim services, and courtroom procedures. As a result, the reports made by first responding officers have become more accurate and informative during review, investigation, and prosecution.

—*Hinds County Sheriff's Office, Mississippi*

Police/Advocate Response

Law enforcement responses that involve both officers and victim advocates often provide the best outcomes for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking. These teams respond to incidents together, providing support to victims at the scene and follow-up after an incident. A study in New Haven, CT, compared the outcomes of a police/advocate team response to the standard law enforcement response to domestic violence (a single visit from police officers at the time of the incident). Researchers found that in the 12 months following an initial domestic violence call, only 20 percent of the victims who received a follow-up visit from a police officer and an advocate needed repeat police intervention for further

domestic violence, compared with more than 40 percent of the victims who received the standard law enforcement response (Casey et al., 2007). In a subsequent study, victims/survivors who had police/advocate team intervention reported a higher rate of satisfaction with the police, and were more likely to report feeling respected and safe (Stover, Berkman, Desai, & Marans, 2010).

Law enforcement partnerships with domestic violence agencies enhance victim safety. The Lethality Assessment Program (LAP) is a collaborative partnership among law enforcement, domestic violence programs, the state domestic violence coalition, and researchers. First instituted in Maryland, LAP-associated police departments use a research-based lethality assessment tool with victims/survivors of domestic violence during 911-call responses. Officer-advocate teams follow up with home visits with victims/survivors who are assessed to be at high risk for continuing, escalated violence. The team encourages high-risk victims to pursue legal advocacy, counseling, emergency housing, healthcare, and other services offered by the local domestic violence program. In 2008, in those jurisdictions utilizing LAP, 56 percent of the victims sought the services of domestic violence programs, while in non-LAP districts only 28 percent of the victims contacted domestic violence services after a police response to a 911 call. Maryland's intimate partner homicides declined by 41 percent in the first 4 years (2007—2010) of LAP (Reckdenwald & Parker, 2010). LAP was initiated with OVW funds and has been replicated in 11 other states to date.

The following subgrantee narrative describes the interactions and communications between the victim/survivor, advocate, and dedicated domestic violence/sexual assault detective and the benefits to the victim:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding allows for one detective to be dedicated to serving only domestic/sexual assault victims in conjunction with victim advocates. Without this funding, victims would be served on a rotation basis by law enforcement with no coordination with support service. The coordination of law enforcement and support services, that are typically provided by victim advocates, increases the likelihood of the victim following through with the prosecution of the perpetrator. Once a victim is provided with his/her basic needs, without the perpetrator, and has the emotional support of an advocate while going through the judicial process, [that victim] is empower[ed] to provide for his/her own safety. By having one full-time detective assigned to the domestic/sexual violence unit, he is able to obtain additional information from the advocate as it becomes available and is able to provide the victim with a continuous update on his/her case. This can include when the perpetrator was arrested, if he is out on bail, if he has been served with the restraining order, etc. This information provides the victim with a sense of safety as he/she knows where the perpetrator is and if the restraining order is in fact in effect (the perpetrator has been served). Should the victim need the assistance of law enforcement due to the perpetrator violating the restraining order, he/she can contact the detective and provide additional information.

—City of Homestead, Florida

Spectrum of Law Enforcement Responsibilities

A law enforcement officer's responsibilities begin with the initial response to the sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking call. The officer engages in a continuum of activities to ensure victim safety: making arrests of the predominant aggressor at incident scenes, referring the victim to services, fully investigating cases to enhance effective prosecution, serving protection orders on offenders, doing periodic safety checks on the victim, and making arrests for violations of bail conditions and protection orders. States are providing STOP Program funding to law enforcement agencies that are handling a broad range of these activities:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

This program allowed detectives to focus on handling the needs of the victims, beyond just the arrest of the batterer. Additional time was concentrated on assisting victims in obtaining protective orders, conducting threat assessments, referrals to Safe Harbor, and the explanation of the process of how their case will be handled in the courts. Repeat offenders were specifically targeted in an effort to stop abuse. Cases that represented an increased probability of continued or escalating violence were closely scrutinized. In these cases, criminal “stay away orders” and bond revocations were pursued to limit the offender’s ability to continue their actions. Follow-up contacts were conducted with victims after a period of time from the original incident, to ensure that there were no additional acts of violence and their needs were being met. Several victims commented that they felt empowered to know that there were people in the system that truly cared for their well-being.

—*St. Tammany Parish Sheriff’s Office, Louisiana*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has continued to allow the Pearl River County Sheriff’s Department to respond to and handle cases of domestic violence in a tremendous way. It provides a single Investigator solely dedicated to investigating each and every case and seeing that each is handled on a one-on-one basis. It allows for follow-ups on all calls and cases and also allows for victim notification on each case as it processes through the criminal justice system. Each victim has the opportunity to meet with the investigator on [his/her] case from the arrest to the prosecution. Without the continuation of the STOP funding, cases of domestic violence would not get the investigation needed for prosecution.

—*Pearl River County Sheriff’s Office, Mississippi*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

With STOP Program funding, Lexington County has been consistent and aggressive with enforcement of no-contact orders. The CDV [criminal domestic violence] investigator has been able to monitor defendants under the no-contact bond violation. We have program coordination for monitoring weekend jail defendants. In the past, there was no way to track those who were sentenced to weekend jail time. The STOP funding has provided funds to train the CDV investigator for technology surveillance. Intensive enforcement has resulted in more guilty pleas which has resulted in greater judicial efficiency. Fewer cases are pending as jury trial requests.

—*Lexington County Sheriff’s Office, South Carolina*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding allows the DV [domestic violence] officer to assist the victim from the time of the initial incident until the final disposition of the case. The victim is given one-on-one attention and guidance throughout the entire judicial process. In many cases, the victim not only views the DV officer as law enforcement, but also as a friend and confidant in which they can turn in their time of need. Many victims continue to stay in touch, even after the case is disposed of. The DV officer not only investigates and obtains warrants and protective orders to serve on offenders who commit these crimes, but also makes certain that each and every resource at their disposal is made available to the victim. I do everything possible to ensure that the offender is held accountable for their actions, as well as taking various measures to ensure victim safety. Many of these measures include obtaining and serving warrants and protective orders, providing transportation for the victim to and from court, or transporting victims to a safe place.

—Lee County Sheriff's Office, Virginia

During calendar years 2009 and 2010, an average of 296 subgrantees (13 percent of all subgrantees reporting) used STOP Program funds for activities carried out by law enforcement personnel, with an average of 262 FTEs⁴⁰ per reporting period. Law enforcement officers funded under the STOP Program in 2009 and 2010 responded to and prepared incident reports for a total of 155,698 cases, investigated 152,666 cases, made 59,642 arrests and 2,349 dual arrests, and referred 70,498 cases to prosecutors. Officers funded by the STOP Program served more than 38,900 protection/restraining orders, made 8,199 arrests for violations of bail and protection orders, and enforced 17,113 warrants over the 2-year period covered by this report.⁴¹

In addition to traditional law enforcement activities, subgrantees also took part in the following activities designed to improve response and arrests of offenders: an average (per reporting period) of 288 used funds to develop, expand, or train specialized law enforcement units; 624 provided training on law enforcement response; 306 addressed identifying and arresting the predominant aggressor in training; 112 developed and/or implemented policies that addressed identification of the primary aggressor; and 83 developed or implemented pro-arrest policies.

Prosecution

Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking presents numerous challenges. Prosecution of violent crimes committed against women often fails without thorough police investigation and detailed reports,

⁴⁰ For more detailed information on the types and numbers of law enforcement activities reported, see Tables 26a and 26b.

⁴¹ Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not engage in the other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity was to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on calls received or incidents responded to, unless those activities also were supported by the STOP Program.

expertise on violence against women, investigators to supplement information from law enforcement, advocates to support victims throughout the criminal legal process, reasonable caseloads, technology to enhance investigation and presentation of evidence, and resources to employ experts for evidence analysis and expert testimony.

Prosecutors without knowledge of violence against women may fail to identify stalking and intimate partner sexual assault and may not devise specialized policies to guide prosecution of these crimes. Prosecutors without resources often charge offenders with misdemeanors, because felony trials are labor and cost intensive (Miller & Nugent, 2002). Without enough staff to prosecute violations of sentencing conditions, either in judicial monitoring or probation revocation proceedings, prosecutors do not vigorously seek serious sanctions (Friday et al., 2006). Funding from OVW over the past 17 years has been instrumental in enhancing both the expertise and resources targeted to prosecution of violent crimes against women across the country.

Outreach to victims, coupled with the proper charging of abusers and rigorous prosecution, safeguards victims/survivors and their children from further abuse and reduces recidivism by criminal abusers (Wooldredge & Thistlethwaite, 2005). A recent study confirms the importance of outreach to victims: researchers found that “victim contact” with prosecutors’ offices, especially direct personal communication with staff, may protect against future intimate partner violence. Repeat IPV police incidents were reduced 30 percent when victims had direct communication with prosecutors (Rhodes, Cerulli, Kothari, Dichter, & Marcus, 2011). Researchers suggest that victims may be more inclined to participate in the criminal process if prosecutors mitigate the “negative consequences for victims, including loss of privacy, feelings of confusion, and disillusionment fueled by frustration” through improved protocol and practices (Rhodes et al., 2011).

Practitioners report that when police have carefully developed evidence, prosecutors often are able to prevail during plea deliberations or at trial without victim testimony or cooperation (Gwinn, 2010; Pence & Eng, 2010). The impact of concerted efforts in evidence collection is reflected in the *Blueprint for Safety* collaboration in St. Paul, MN, which originated from a safety audit funded by OVW (Pence & Eng, 2010).

When police are able to produce substantial evidence, including witnesses, video or audio recordings, signs of struggle, multiple victims, and DNA evidence, prosecutors are much more likely to file charges for sex crimes (Spohn & Tellis, 2012). In general, prosecutors are hesitant to file charges when the victim/survivor’s credibility is in question (Holleran, Beichner, & Spohn, 2010). Extra-legal information becomes important in assessing “convictability” when evidence is limited (Rosay, Wood, Rivera, Postle, & TePas, 2011). A study of prosecutorial decision-making in Philadelphia and Kansas City showed that prosecutors are less likely to file charges in sexual assault cases involving intimate partner or acquaintance rape and more likely to take action in stranger cases (Holleran et al., 2010). In a study in Los Angeles of specialized assistant district attorneys, partner or acquaintance sexual violence

was more carefully scrutinized by police and less often prosecuted than “identified stranger” sexual violence cases (Spohn & Tellis, 2012). These practices produce less than satisfactory outcomes for victims/survivors of crimes of sexual assault.

Specialized Prosecution

Specialized domestic violence prosecution units may improve prosecution of domestic violence cases. The specialized prosecution unit in Cook County, IL (Chicago) obtained a conviction rate of 71 percent compared with 50 percent for the rest of the office for domestic violence cases (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003). In Milwaukee, the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit increased felony convictions five-fold (Harrell, Schaffer, DeStefano, & Castro, 2006). Although victims/survivors most commonly cite fear of retaliation as a barrier to their participation in prosecution, a three-state study found that the fear was reduced in sites with specialized prosecution, increased victim advocacy, and specialized domestic violence courts (Harrell, Castro, Newmark, & Visher, 2007).

Subgrantees in Missouri and Texas discuss how having specialized prosecutors has improved outcomes in terms of victim safety and well-being and offender accountability:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Before we received STOP Program funding, the Sex Crimes and Child Abuse Unit had five attorneys handling all child sexual/physical abuse cases and all adult sex crimes cases in Jackson County. The attorneys in the unit were extremely overworked because of the massive caseloads and the burnout was high. STOP Program funding has allowed us to acquire three additional prosecutors dedicated solely to the review and prosecution of adult sex crimes cases. This shift has actualized a monumental change in this unit. It allows for the faster review of cases submitted for filing, better preparation of cases for trial, earlier and better plea dispositions due to early case preparation and specialization in working with adult victims of sexual abuse. The end result is more effective prosecution of perpetrators of adult sex crimes, with less re-victimization of the women we are trying to help.

—Jackson County Prosecutor's Office, Missouri

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to receiving STOP funds, our office was not able to take the needed time to adequately service victims due to lack of manpower and time restraints. Having our specialized Domestic/Family Violence Prosecution Unit has allowed us to better access each individual case so that we can be more successful in servicing our victims. This leads to more cooperation from our victims allowing us to have better outcomes in case dispositions, thus leading to holding the offender accountable for [his/her] actions. It also has allowed us to better access the needs of each individual victim/survivor so that we can address safety needs in a timely manner.

—*Lubbock County, Texas*

Vertical Prosecution

Vertical prosecution provides the victim/survivor and the prosecutor the opportunity to work together throughout the life of the case. Cook County, IL (Chicago) victims/survivors reported higher rates of satisfaction with the specialized domestic violence prosecution unit, which featured specially trained prosecutors, vertical prosecution, and its own victim advocates, compared with prosecutors who handled domestic violence cases outside the unit. Victims/survivors who were helped by these units also were more likely to appear in court: 75 percent of victims appeared, compared with just 25 percent in domestic violence cases not handled by the unit.

Vertical prosecution has been instituted in numerous STOP Program-funded prosecution offices. As the following subgrantee relates, it has led to more convictions in domestic violence and sexual assault cases in an Ohio jurisdiction:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding has allowed for vertical prosecution to occur. Without STOP funding, this office would have to distribute its domestic violence and sexual assault caseload among five different courtrooms and different prosecutors, with already overburdened dockets. This was done in the past and it led to many dismissals, no-bills, not-guilty verdicts, and inconsistent plea offers and sentencing recommendations. With a vertical prosecutor, who only deals with domestic violence cases and sexual assaults, our office has been able to put someone in charge of tracking, prosecuting and convicting domestic violence and sexual assault cases. This has led to increased numbers of successful prosecutions, less recidivism of offenders, and more satisfied victims.

—*Mahoning Valley Justice Unit, Ohio*

Prosecutors funded under the STOP Program received a total of 312,963 cases of sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence and stalking and accepted 235,229 (75 percent) of those cases for prosecution during the two reporting periods. STOP

Program-funded prosecution offices showed a dismissal rate of 32 percent for domestic violence misdemeanors.⁴²

During calendar years 2009 and 2010, an average of 294 subgrantees used STOP Program funds for prosecution activities carried out by prosecutors with an average of 267 FTEs. STOP funds were used to develop, expand, or train specialized prosecution units by an average of 295 subgrantees. Overall, subgrantees engaged in the following activities designed to improve the prosecution response: an average of 356 provided training on prosecution response; 96 developed and/or implemented policies on victim-witness notification; and 74 addressed policy development and/or implementation regarding protection order violations. The lower dismissal rate in STOP Program-funded prosecution agencies may reflect the impact of specialized prosecutors engaging in training and the development and implementation of strategic policies that result in increased offender accountability.

Courts

There are more than 130 specialized domestic violence courts in 27 states in the United States (Labriola, Bradley, O’Sullivan, Rempel, & Moore, 2009). The majority of the specialized or integrated domestic violence courts are in New York, California, Florida, Michigan, and North Carolina. There are also courts with specialized domestic violence dockets in criminal and civil protection order cases in most states (Klein, 2009). Successful and effective prosecution of domestic violence is augmented where courts have consolidated domestic violence calendars and increased pretrial and post-conviction monitored supervision of defendants (Harrell et al., 2006). Domestic violence courts appear to process cases more efficiently (Peterson & Dixon, 2005) and may increase both offender compliance with court-ordered conditions and enhanced penalties for non-compliance (Klein, 2009; Harrell et al., 2006; Newmark, Rempel, Diffily, & Kane, 2001).

Although there is great diversity in domestic violence court models and practices, several studies in jurisdictions across the country have identified key areas of processing and services for domestic violence cases that are essential to managing specialized courts effectively. One study of 106 jurisdictions with specialized domestic violence courts found that 70 percent shared the following key practices and processes essential to effective management of specialized courts: 1) effective management of domestic violence cases, coordinating the cases involving the relevant parties, and integrating information for the court; 2) specialized intake and court staffing for domestic violence cases; 3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims/survivors by court staff, often aided by related, specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; 4) court processes to ensure victims/survivors’ safety, from metal detectors and separate waiting rooms to special orders and victim referrals; 5) increased court monitoring and

⁴² This percentage is based on the number of dismissals compared with all other dispositions. Subgrantees were instructed to report only on the disposition of the original case (which is characterized by the most serious offense), not on the dispositions of lesser charges or counts pled to by the offender. For more information on the dispositions of cases, see Table 27.

enforcement of batterer compliance with court orders, often supervised by related specialized probation units; 6) consideration of children involved in domestic violence; and 7) enhanced domestic violence training for judges (Keilitz, 2004).

Other studies have examined the importance and effectiveness of elements similar to those identified in the Keilitz study, such as expedited processing of domestic violence cases, including accessible, efficient, and timely systems for disposition of civil and criminal cases (Klein, 2009; Logan, 2006); enhanced access to information from diverse court dockets and court databases (Hulse, 2010); clerical assistance for litigants, readily available translator services, court accompaniment by advocates, childcare for children of victims, access to law libraries, expedited proceedings, respectful judges and court personnel (Bell, Perez, Goodman, & Dutton, 2011; Ptacek, 1999); court and judicial resources to monitor batterer compliance with court orders, and enforcing those orders with victim input to promote victim safety (Gondolf, 2002); certification and education of guardians ad litem and custody evaluators on domestic violence issues (Dalton, Drozd, & Wong, 2006); judges' sensitivity to the needs of domestic violence victims; and an understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence (Bell et al., 2011; Klein, 2009; Labriola et al., 2009; Ptacek, 1999).

A study of the OVW-funded Milwaukee Judicial Oversight Demonstration Initiative (JODI) domestic violence court found that domestic violence probationers involved in the initiative were half as likely to recidivate as domestic violence offenders on probation before the initiative. Rearrest for violence dropped from 8 percent to 4.2 percent. The average number of new arrests for all crimes also dropped significantly. JODI employed pretrial court monitoring of domestic violence offenders; those violating bail conditions were jailed for short terms. Pretrial incarceration for non-compliance was associated with an increase in post-conviction compliance (Harrell et al., 2006). Similar reductions in recidivism rates occurred at a JODI domestic violence court in Dorchester, MA (Harrell et al., 2007).

Rates of conviction are higher and dismissals are lower in many specialized domestic violence courts (Davis, Smith, & Rabbit, 2001; Harrell et al., 2006; Klein, 2009; Newmark et al., 2001). In Cook County, IL (Chicago), for example, the conviction rate in four misdemeanor domestic violence courts was 73 percent, compared with 22.9 percent in general criminal courts. Victim participation in the criminal process in the misdemeanor domestic violence courts was 73 percent, compared with 40 percent in general courts. Specialized courts also were more likely to incarcerate high risk abusers:⁴³ 31.3 percent in the specialized courts compared with 6.7 percent in general criminal courts (Hartley & Frohmann, 2003).

In a study of the Domestic Violence Intake Center (DVIC) in Washington, DC, victims said the court experience was empowering and the criminal court process increased their quality of life and reduced depression and fear (Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010). A

⁴³ "High-risk" abusers in this study were those with a history of domestic violence, including the following: injury inflicted to the victim/survivor, use of weapons with threats, and/or domestic battery accompanied by threats.

positive court experience also appears to increase the numbers of victims who say they would use the criminal justice system in the future should they again be battered (Belknap & Sullivan, 2002; Cattaneo & Goodman, 2010; Zweig & Burt, 2003). Another study found that 75 percent of victims said they would be more likely to report future violence if a domestic violence court was available (B. Smith, Davis, Nickles, & Davies, 2001).

STOP funding for an additional case manager enabled a Louisiana district court to keep victims/survivors safer:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the Orleans Parish Criminal Court to employ an additional case manager to handle the volume of domestic violence-related arrests that are referred to Domestic Violence Monitoring Court. The court would have been overwhelmed without the employment of this additional case manager and would have been unable to properly provide the protective services needed by victims of domestic violence. This also enabled the court to expand its outreach efforts into the community to make the public aware of the services offered by the Domestic Violence Monitoring Court.

—Orleans Parish Criminal District Court, Louisiana

In the following examples, STOP Program-funded probation officers were critical to the success of domestic violence courts in monitoring offenders' compliance with court orders:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Prior to receiving this funding, we were not able to form the Domestic Violence Court because of the need for a probation officer. Without these funds, our budget would not allow for the hiring or retention of the probation officers. The probation officers are essential to the Domestic Violence Court because of the mandatory reporting policies. The probation officers ensure that the offenders are complying with court orders by attending court-ordered services. If the offender does not comply, then the probation officers send a report to the assigned assistant district attorney, resulting in a hearing before the Court. This is an integral part of the Domestic Violence Court due to the immediate sanctions and offender accountability. These efforts have increased the safety of victims of domestic abuse because of the ability to monitor the offenders.

—Custer County Domestic Violence Court, Oklahoma

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding [for one probation officer] has allowed the continued availability of the Domestic Violence Court Docket in Seminole County. This docket is a benefit to the county due to the increase in the number of domestic violence reports and arrests that are made each year in this small county. The docket allows for close monitoring of these offenders through the court hearings and through the life of their probationary period. Close contact is maintained between the batterer's intervention program, the district attorney's office and the court, which holds the offenders to a higher degree of accountability and has also caused a decrease in recidivism rates of the participating domestic violence offenders.

—*Family Resource Center, Oklahoma*

Funds were used for specialized courts or court activities addressing sexual assault, domestic violence/dating violence, and stalking by an average of 15 STOP subgrantees in 2009 and 2010; 9 of these subgrantees used funds for judicial monitoring activities of convicted offenders, holding an average of 1.8 hearings per offender for an average of 3,276 offenders in 2009 and 2010. These courts held offenders accountable by imposing sanctions for violations of probation conditions and other court orders.

As illustrated in Table 8, 43 percent of all violations disposed of by STOP Program-funded courts in 2009 resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2010, 63 percent had this result.

Table 8. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders in STOP Program-funded courts in 2009 and 2010

Type of Disposition	Total Violations			
	2009 (N = 2,124)		2010 (N = 1,254)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Verbal/written warning	802	38	219	17
Partial/full revocation of probation	927	43	808	63
Conditions added	231	11	176	13
Fine	2	<.1	30	2
No action taken	172	8	56	4

NOTE: N is the total number of dispositions of violations. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period.

Probation Supervision

Supervised probation offers the criminal justice system an alternative to incarceration of offenders. The primary role of the probation officer is to monitor offenders' compliance with specific court-ordered conditions. Probation and parole

departments have devised policies and practices to respond to the heightened scrutiny and more nuanced sentencing by courts in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Following the example of police, prosecutors, and courts, probation departments funded by the STOP Program have adopted specialized caseloads for monitoring these offenders. Many of these specialized probation officers practice more intensive supervision of their probationers, including unscheduled home visits, curfew checks, and random drug and alcohol screening. Many require attendance at batterer intervention programs (BIPs) or sex offender treatment programs. Many of these specialized units provide outreach and support to victims/survivors.

Research suggests there are several essential ingredients for effective probation supervision of perpetrators. One is victim-focused supervision: a primary goal of the supervision must be victim/survivor protection, with a secondary, but significant goal, of victim/survivor restitution. To achieve both, periodic probation officer contact and communication with victims/survivors is essential. This ongoing outreach to victims/survivors requires a shift away from traditional approaches to probation, which tend to focus on the offender, not the victim/survivor (Klein & Crowe, 2008; Klein, Wilson, Crowe, & DeMichele, 2005). Officers should also monitor compliance with state and federal firearms prohibitions (Crowe et al., 2009; Klein, 2006).

A study of Rhode Island's Department of Corrections/Probation and Parole found that a specialized probation supervision unit for those convicted of domestic violence significantly reduced the risk of reabuse and rearrest among low-risk offenders, and increased victim satisfaction when compared with nonspecialized supervision (Klein et al., 2005). Findings of a study that examined probation outcomes in three probation agencies in Oklahoma, Iowa, and Colorado suggested that reducing probation officer caseloads, when combined with the application of evidence-based practice, can reduce criminal recidivism. Specialized officers with reduced caseloads are better able to manage cases, thereby improving probation outcomes (Kuck Jalbert et al., 2011).

Another critical practice is strict monitoring of all probationary conditions, particularly attendance at and compliance with assigned BIPs. BIPs, especially those embedded in a criminal justice response system that mandates participation and imposes swift sanctions for noncompliance, appear to deescalate reassault and other abuse (Gondolf, 2004). Abusers who are unwilling or unable to complete these programs are significantly more likely to abuse again than those who complete them (Gordon & Moriarty, 2003; Puffett & Gavin, 2004). By tightly monitoring offenders' participation in BIPs, probation officers can bring noncompliant abusers back to court for probation modification or revocation before they offend again.

Although sex offenders constitute a large and increasing number of prison inmates, most are eventually released into the community. Intensive community supervision for this population may offer an effective way to reduce the threat of future victimization. A study of 917 convicted male sex offenders on probation in 17 states

subject to community supervision found that although the overall recidivism rate was 16 percent, only 4.5 percent of offenders committed a new sex crime during probation (Meloy, 2005).

In Hawaii, a probation deterrence program that imposes swift, certain, and proportionate consequences on probationers who violate the terms of their probation has achieved significant success. After 1 year in the deterrence program, probationers (when compared with probationers in a control group) were 55 percent less likely to be arrested for new crimes, 72 percent less likely to use drugs, 61 percent less likely to skip an appointment with a supervising officer, and 53 percent less likely to have their probation revoked (McEvoy, 2012).

Some subgrantees in California have used STOP funds for specialized probation officers. These officers have smaller caseloads and more frequent contact with offenders, maintain regular contact with victims/survivors and refer them to services, respond swiftly when offenders are out of compliance, and are able to develop relationships with other criminal justice system and community partners:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

This grant has enabled two deputy probation officers to conduct intensive supervision of domestic violence offenders throughout Contra Costa County [California], and establish collaborative efforts with local law enforcement agencies. Because the officers' caseloads are smaller than normal caseloads, the grant has enabled them to contact a greater number of victims of domestic violence and refer them to community-based organizations, and further support the victims' efforts to enforce protective orders and ensure victim safety. It has allowed the probation officers to provide offenders an opportunity to seek treatment to address substance abuse issues and an opportunity for offenders to modify their violent behavior.

—*Contra Costa County Probation Department, California*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Regular, intensive supervision was not possible prior to this program being implemented. This particular caseload is very labor-intensive and requires considerable follow-up. Offenders must be quickly held accountable when violations of probation are noted. As well, it has provided victims of these crimes the ability to communicate directly with the probation officer assigned to the program and advise when and if they are being further victimized.

—*Glenn County Probation Department, California*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the department to assign one senior probation officer and one deputy probation officer to intensively supervise caseloads of no more than 30 probationers convicted of domestic violence offenses. These small caseloads allow the probation officer the opportunity to make frequent home and victim contacts, as well as, to immediately arrest a probationer who violates his conditions of probation. The funding further allows the caseloads to remain continuously covered and provides a continuity of staffing. Additionally, staff assigned have received extensive domestic violence training and have been able to develop an excellent working relationship with other law enforcement agencies, the district attorney and the judge.

—Riverside County Probation Department, California

As described by the STOP administrator, the following subgrantee used STOP funds for intense supervision of offenders by a court officer who communicates with the STOP Program-funded prosecutor when offenders are not in compliance:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding pays for a full-time prosecutor in the DA's [district attorney's] office and pays for a court services officer who monitors offenders for the DV [domestic violence] Court. The court services officer attends every domestic violence docket at the Cleveland County Courthouse—misdemeanor and felony. She consults with and makes reports to the DA about offender accountability and makes sure that the DA is aware of all offenders who are not completing the conditions of their probation as ordered by the court. [The] judge who oversees the DV Court in Cleveland County, counts on the information she receives from both the court services officer and the DA to make her rulings when it comes to the DV Court. The two STOP-funded people are also active participants in their coordinated community response team. They have made so much progress in their community that they plan and present DV training to all the new recruits at the Norman Police Academy.

—STOP administrator, Oklahoma

An average of 24 subgrantees funded probation activities during each of the reporting periods covered by this report; these subgrantees hired an average of 27 probation officers. STOP subgrantees reported training 11,172 professionals in the category of corrections officers, which includes probation and parole officers.

As illustrated in Table 9, when offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation officers failed to comply with court-ordered conditions, revocation (partial or full) of probation represented 66 percent of the total dispositions of their violations in 2009 and 46 percent in 2010.⁴⁴

Table 9. Disposition of probation violations by STOP Program-funded probation departments in 2009 and 2010

Type of Disposition	Total Violations			
	2009 (N = 1,590)		2010 (N = 1,596)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Verbal/written warning	176	11	502	31
Partial/full revocation of probation	1,046	66	732	46
Conditions added	213	13	174	11
Fine	69	4	42	3
No action taken	86	5	146	9

NOTE: *N* is the total number of dispositions reported for each reporting period. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period.

During 2009 and 2010, STOP Program-funded probation officers supervised an annual average of 3,921 offenders and made a total of 108,743 contacts with those offenders. The majority of the contacts (51 percent) were face to face, 32 percent were by telephone, and 17 percent were unscheduled surveillance. STOP Program-funded agencies also had a total of 8,869 contacts with an average of 1,412 victims/survivors during 2009 and 2010.

Sexual Assault

Sexual assault is any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. Falling under the definition of sexual assault are activities such as forced sexual intercourse, forcible sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2012). Sexual assault is perpetrated in a range of relationships, from strangers, acquaintances, and dating partners to intimate or married partners of the victims/survivors (White, McMullin, Swartout, & Gollehon, 2008).

The recently released National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), based on 16,507 interviews with men and women in the United States, found that

⁴⁴ The overwhelming majority of dispositions of violations were reported under "Other conditions of probation or parole." These high numbers could include technical violations (e.g., use of alcohol or controlled substances, failure to report) or they could also indicate the subgrantees' inability to report dispositions in the specific categories provided on the reporting form. Those categories are for the following violations: protection order, new criminal behavior, failure to attend batterer intervention program, or failure to attend other mandated treatment. For more detail on dispositions for these specific categories, see Tables 30a and 30b.

nearly one in five (18.3 percent) women has experienced rape⁴⁵ at least once, 44.6 percent have experienced some other form of sexual violence, and approximately 1 in 10 women has been raped by an intimate partner. Of all female victims who had experienced rape—whether completed, attempted, or alcohol or drug facilitated—51 percent were raped by a current or former intimate partner and 41 percent by an acquaintance (Black et al., 2011).

Women under age 25 are at increased risk for sexual crimes: More than three-quarters (79.6 percent) of women surveyed in the NISVS study who had been victims of a completed rape were first raped before their 25th birthday, with approximately 42 percent of these victims experiencing their first rape before the age of 18 (Black et al., 2011). The Campus Sexual Assault Study, which surveyed more than 6,800 undergraduate students in 2 large public universities, found that approximately 14 percent of the 5,466 women completing the survey had been victims of at least 1 completed sexual assault since entering college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007).

Studies of intimate partner sexual assault demonstrate significantly greater prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder, stress, and dissociation when compared with non-intimate partner sexual assault and women who were physically assaulted only (McFarlane et al., 2005; Temple, Weston, Rodriguez, & Marshall, 2007). A study of more than 3,000 women between the ages of 18 and 86 suggests a lifetime prevalence rate of sexual assault as high as 18 percent for the 112 million women living in the United States, with only 1 in 5 women reporting their victimization to the police. Of those reported, only 37 percent were prosecuted (Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & McCauley, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006).

The shame and fear experienced by survivors of sexual assault may prevent them from seeking assistance. In a study of 215 college students (55 percent of whom were female), the most crucial barriers reported were shame and guilt, concerns over confidentiality, fear of retaliation, and worry about not being believed (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). In a qualitative study of 29 victims/survivors who had not sought assistance, researchers found that these victims/survivors were trying to protect themselves, thinking the services would not help them, could not protect them, and might cause them greater psychological harm (D. Patterson, Greeson, & Campbell, 2009).

VAWA permits STOP-funded programs to fund the training of sexual assault forensic medical personnel examiners in the following areas: treatment of trauma related to sexual assault; collection, preservation, and analysis of evidence; and providing expert testimony. In addition, STOP Program subgrantees provide training to increase the understanding of the intersection of domestic violence, sexual violence, and stalking. They also may develop and implement policies and protocols that lead

⁴⁵ In the NISVS study, rape is separated into three types—completed forced penetration, attempted forced penetration, and completed alcohol- or drug-facilitated penetration.

to better responses and improved services to victims/survivors of sexual assault and stalking.

The specialized training of medical personnel is designed not only to improve the quality of the examination and evidence collected, but also to provide victims/survivors of sexual trauma with compassionate treatment during the examination process. This training is vital to ensure that victims/survivors obtain competent medical care and follow-up services in a manner that supports their immediate needs and long-term healing. Training on the collection of forensic evidence during the examination is critical to holding offenders accountable in the criminal justice process. Historically, victims/survivors of sexual assault often were retraumatized by their experiences in hospitals. Triage usually left them waiting hours for forensic exams. Physicians often were untrained in forensic evidence collection and not inclined to become involved in a procedure that could require them to appear in court. That lack of training compromised the ability of the criminal justice system to prosecute perpetrators successfully. In sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs, trained nurse examiners provide prompt, sensitive, supportive, and compassionate care. The nurses also follow forensic protocols, ensuring the highest quality evidence.

Programs that include SANEs and sexual assault response teams (SARTs) have been found to greatly improve the quality of health care provided to women who have been sexually assaulted and to improve the quality of forensic evidence. They also enhance law enforcement's ability to collect information and to file charges, thus increasing the likelihood of successful prosecution (R. Campbell, Bybee, Ford, & Patterson, 2008; R. Campbell et al., 2005; Crandall & Helitzer, 2003).

A North Dakota subgrantee describes the impact of having STOP-funded SANEs available 24 hours a day in the community:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Our community now has professionally trained sexual assault nurse examiners dedicated to serving victims/survivors on call 24 hours a day. The victims of sexual violent crimes are now provided immediate, comprehensive exams by professionals trained to collect evidence. In addition, individuals are able to reach a SANE 24 hours a day by calling our crisis line to request an exam or to ask medical questions regarding sexual assault. We provide assistance to victims/survivors in obtaining support by providing referrals and health care services.

—Jamestown Sexual Assault Response Team, North Dakota

The following subgrantees used STOP funds to provide essential training on sexual assault:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding continues to allow NYPTI [New York Prosecutor’s Training Institute] to enhance the level of expertise and professionalism among sexual assault prosecutors. It allows us to coordinate and support sexual assault prosecutors statewide by helping NYPTI provide training to prosecutors, investigators, sexual assault nurse examiners and forensic scientists.

—New York Prosecutor’s Training Institute, New York

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding is so vital to the anti-sexual violence movement and to the Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault. The funding from STOP supports the majority of the training that is provided through the coalition to professionals. The funding enables the coalition to have a law enforcement officer at the police academy to provide training to new recruits, detectives, and investigators. The funding enables us to work with the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council to provide training specific to prosecuting sex crimes to prosecutors. It supports the annual mock trial training that provides court [experience] for SANEs and gives advocates and other professionals an intimate look at the criminal justice process from both the defense and prosecution sides. The STOP grant enables the state to have a protocol on medical evidence collection to provide uniformity and consistency across Indiana for forensic nurse examiners. All of this training improves the response to victims and enhances the processes that will ultimately result in higher conviction rates and hopefully higher reporting rates.

—Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Indiana

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the Olmsted County SAIC [Sexual Assault Inter-Agency Council] to develop and train various disciplines on a coordinated, victim-centered, sexual assault response protocol. Prior to the Olmsted County SAIC, there was no multidisciplinary protocol for sexual assault responders in our community. Since its inception, the Olmsted County SAIC has provided extensive training and ongoing monitoring of protocol compliance to various sexual assault responding agencies. This training and ongoing monitoring of protocol compliance ensures all core responding agencies are providing a victim-centered response.

—Dodge, Fillmore, Olmsted County Victim Services, Minnesota

Subgrantees used funds to expand access to critical counseling services for sexual assault victims/survivors:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

With this grant funding, the program was able to hire a licensed therapist to meet victims' needs. This position offers no-cost professional counseling services at a safe place. This position is a great asset to the program and the victims/survivors we serve. Many individuals we see have been in counseling before and report [that] their counselors would tell them why they didn't "deal with" sexual assault or abuse and they would have to talk with another counselor about those issues. Now victims see one therapist to learn coping skills for all areas they identify as the presenting problem. Clients have more faith that their needs are being met, someone cares, and their abuse matters and is worth processing. Prior to funding by this program, Carteret County Rape Crisis [Program] did not have sufficient funding to support such a position. This funding will hopefully influence the county, community, and board that having a trained and licensed therapist at this and all rape crisis programs is an asset not only to the primary and secondary victims they serve, but also to the community. Individuals coming to therapy are learning positive coping and to work through their abuse instead of turning to alternatives such as criminal behavior, substance abuse, and child abuse.

—*Carteret County Rape Crisis Program, North Carolina*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

The STOP funding has allowed our program to establish our sexual assault advocacy team. These advocates respond to an on-scene crisis call, and help the victim during their time of need. Our sexual assault/ domestic violence program is the only one in La Paz County, and has allowed law enforcement and other agencies to better utilize our services for their clients. We have opened a new door of opportunity for victims who need support and security during a crisis.

—*Colorado River Regional Crisis Shelter, Colorado*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has allowed the St. Landry-Evangeline Sexual Assault Center the opportunity to provide counseling services to more clients throughout St. Landry and Evangeline parishes. The therapist has been able to be more visible in these parishes as well as being able to provide sessions to accommodate those with difficult schedules.

—*St. Landry-Evangeline Sexual Assault Center, Louisiana*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Primarily, STOP funding assists in maintaining an office in Clarksville, Tennessee, where we see the victims funded by this grant. It allows us to provide therapeutic services to a population that might otherwise be faced with the need to travel to Nashville to receive such specialized treatment. Certainly, without STOP funding, we would have to reduce the number of clients that we see in that area, thus leaving many victims of sexual assault without a specialized treatment facility in their area. STOP funding had enabled us to provide healing therapeutic services to many victims of sexual assault.

—*Sexual Assault Center, Tennessee*

The following subgrantees used STOP funds to enhance training, protocol, and practice for the prosecution of sex crimes:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP Program funding allowed the Center for Victims of Violence and Crime (CVVC) to focus on systems-wide training to a variety of professionals who are often the first contact with sexual violence victims. These audiences have primarily included law enforcement, prosecutors, and probation and parole. CVVC presents information on how to be an effective, victim-sensitive first responder. Training curriculum includes information on all victim's rights and services and the traumatic impacts of sexual violence. Our overall goal is to ensure that systems professionals are equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to respond effectively, both in terms of sensitive treatment of the victim and best practice for successful prosecution of these cases. Current training is based on revised law enforcement protocols for responding to these types of crime.

—*Allegheny County District Attorney's Office, Pennsylvania*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

[We] established a multiagency collaborative board consisting of law enforcement, judges, prosecutors, probation officers, and social service agencies, to address [violence against women] issues and develop and implement response protocols. This has allowed us to more effectively share information and resources to better address [violence against women] cases, which has improved the consistency with which these cases are prosecuted. Funds have also allowed us to assign a prosecutor to prosecute adult sexual assault cases which has also improved the consistency with which these cases are prosecuted. This helped us to develop additional expertise through training and experience. [Funds have also allowed us to provide] training of law enforcement and sexual assault nurses in collection of physical evidence, testifying in court, and photographic evidence. This has helped provide better investigators and more evidence to help prosecute these difficult cases with positive outcomes.

—*Marion County Commissioners, Hawaii*

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

STOP funding has enhanced the NOPD's [New Orleans Police Department's] Sex Crimes Unit's ability to increase investigations into unsolved adult sexual assault cold cases where the identification of a suspect has been made through the CODIS (combined DNA indexing system) system. Without the additional funding for overtime to support these investigative initiatives, the unit would not be able to expedite the cases for prosecutorial review by the district attorney's office in a timely manner. In addition to the CODIS investigations, evidence and information also gathered during cold-case investigations lead to warrants, arrests and clearances that result in prosecutions.

—*New Orleans Police Department, Louisiana*

An average of 224 sexual assault organizations—180 local programs and 44 state sexual assault coalitions⁴⁶—received STOP Program funds, and sexual assault victims/survivors made up 12 percent of all victims/survivors served with program funds in 2009 and 2010. An average of 985 subgrantees provided services to sexual assault victims, 177 engaged in law enforcement activities that addressed sexual assault, and 162 prosecuted sexual assault cases. STOP Program-funded prosecutors disposed of 6,835 sexual assault cases during 2009 and 2010, and an overall average of 82 percent of those cases resulted in convictions.⁴⁷

One of the statutory purpose areas of the STOP Program is the training of sexual assault forensic medical examiners: an average of 14 percent (138) of subgrantees using funds for training reported that they used funds for SANE training, and a total of 7,105 SANEs received STOP Program-funded training during 2009 and 2010. STOP Program funds also were used by an average of 50 STOP subgrantees to support 45 FTE SANE staff positions per reporting period.

An average of 645 subgrantees—66 percent of those using funds for training—provided training on topics related specifically to sexual assault: sexual assault dynamics, services, statutes and codes, and forensic examination.

Stalking

The most recent national survey on stalking, NISVS, revealed that 16.2 percent of women in the United States or approximately 19.3 million adult women have been stalked, and 4.2 percent of women, or 5.2 million adult women were stalked in the 12 months before the survey. Two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the women stalked were targeted by current or former intimate partners. Women were overwhelmingly

⁴⁶ Subgrantees also reported that an average of 500 dual (meaning that they address both domestic violence and sexual assault) programs, 9 tribal dual programs, and 24 dual state coalitions received STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010.

⁴⁷ This rate includes deferred adjudications. For purposes of comparison, the average conviction rate for domestic violence cases was 67 percent; for stalking cases, the rate was 71.4 percent.

stalked by men (82.5 percent). Unwanted telephone calls and voice or text-messaging were the most common (78.8 percent) stalking tactics employed against women. A majority of the female victims of stalking were first stalked before age 25, and 20 percent were first stalked between the ages of 11 and 17 (Black et al., 2011).

The danger of stalking is often underestimated. Stalking has been associated with a range of serious consequences for victims/survivors, including an increased risk of violence, injury, and homicide (Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Swanberg, 2007; Roberts, 2005). A study using a nonrandom sample of more than 1,000 North American stalkers found that nearly a third had assaulted their victims. (Mohandie, Meloy, McGowan, & Williams, 2006). A 10-city study of female abuse victims and female victims of homicide or attempted homicide committed by their intimate partners found a strong association between stalking and subsequent lethal or near-lethal attacks. It found that stalking, when combined with a history of physical assault by a former or estranged partner, places women at greater danger of becoming victims of homicide or attempted homicide by intimate partners. It also found that women who reported that they were being followed or spied on by a partner had more than a twofold increase in the risk of becoming a homicide victim (McFarlane, Abeita, & Watson, 2002).

It appears that women who are stalked after obtaining a protective order are at particularly high risk for violence, notwithstanding other variables including the involvement of minor children, prior abuse, and the length of the relationship. One study found, for example, that women who were stalked after the protective orders were issued were 4 to 5 times more likely to experience physical abuse, severe physical violence, and injury and nearly 10 times more likely to experience sexual assault, compared with other women with orders (Logan, Shannon, Walker, & Faragher, 2006). Intimate stalkers are persistent and more likely to recidivate than non-intimate stalkers (Logan & Walker, 2009). Intimate stalkers may be the least deterred by criminal justice intervention (Mohandie et al., 2006).

While stalking traditionally takes the form of unwanted spatial contact, cyberstalking—unwanted contact or monitoring through electronic devices—is experienced by 26 percent of stalking victims, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009). The accelerated development and availability of communications technology, combined with underreporting of stalking crimes in general, means that the actual number of cyberstalking victims is likely much higher. Studies of cyberstalking rates among college students reveal that between 3 and 41 percent are subject to various forms of cyberstalking and suggest that college students are at greater risk of cyberstalking victimization than the general population (Alexy, Burgess, Baker, & Smoyak, 2005; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Kraft & Wang, 2010; Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2012). Cyberstalking shares the fundamentals of traditional stalking and leads to many of the same consequences for victims (Sheridan & Grant, 2007).

Stalking remains an area in need of attention from law enforcement agencies (Klein, Salomon, Huntington, Dubois, & Lang, 2009). An examination of more than 2,500 domestic violence reports in Rhode Island for 2001–2005 revealed that for every

incident identified as stalking by the police, nearly 21 other incidents that met the definition of stalking were not identified as such by law enforcement. These other cases often involved different charges, such as breaking and entering or violation of a protective order. The study also found that the police-identified stalking cases were much more likely to have witnesses, indicating that the absence of third-party corroborating witnesses is a barrier to proper identification of stalking cases. The failure of law enforcement to identify and charge stalking crimes is pervasive. In a study of 16 large urban counties, only 5 percent of domestic violence suspects were charged with stalking, while 78 percent were charged with simple assault and 12 percent with aggravated assault (E. L. Smith, Farole, Greipp, & Reichard, 2009). Yet NISVS estimates that 5.2 million women and 1.2 million men were stalked in the 12 months before the survey (Black et al., 2011).

Stalking presents unique challenges to the criminal justice system, even when cases are successfully prosecuted. One study found that when stalking increased in frequency, victims were likely to contact criminal justice system personnel, but stalking did not decrease significantly thereafter (Cattaneo, Cho, & Botuck, 2011). Stalkers often continue their crimes after having been charged, prosecuted, convicted, and released. Research indicates a recidivism rate of approximately 60 percent among stalkers (Mohandie et al., 2006).

The dynamics of stalking and the strategies employed by offenders call for specialized training in how best to identify the crime, how to involve the victim/survivor and others in collecting evidence necessary to prosecute the crime, and how to keep the stalking victim/survivor safe, as well as how to coordinate the response among criminal justice agencies and community partners.

An Allegheny County, PA, victim-services agency, part of a CCR that included the district attorney's office, realized the need to begin conversations about stalking with its partners, particularly law enforcement, as a first step toward developing training for and implementing a uniform stalking protocol:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Historically, through working with police officers and victims, it had come to the attention of Crisis Center North (CCN) advocates that knowledge and enforcement of the stalking law was either confused or rarely happening. With some research, it became clear that in Allegheny County there was no one uniform stalking protocol for regional police departments to follow. CCN recognized that this lack of formal direction through policy may lead to understanding why this criminal conduct was largely going unenforced or prosecuted. The development of the survey tool allowed for CCN advocates and regional police chiefs to begin conversations around stalking and how to write a protocol that could be utilized universally by departments in the county. By utilizing an interview setting to conduct the survey, police chiefs or supervising officers were given an open forum in which to cultivate ideas and address concerns. Responses from officers on this format and the survey tool show that they felt their thoughts were heard and would be considered by the CCN staff. Since completing the surveys in late summer 2010, advocates have seen their work returned through better and more open relationships with police officers and department heads. With the upcoming implementation of the stalking protocol and the training that will take place around it, CCN anticipates seeing an increased use of the stalking charge and its prosecution within the courts.

—Allegheny County District Attorney's Office, Pennsylvania

Subgrantees used STOP Program funds for a stalking advocate/coordinator to work with law enforcement and a paralegal in a state's attorney's office:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Funding allowed for the hiring of a victim advocate that was the stalking coordinator. Without the expertise and trust that had been developed between the victim and advocate, law enforcement would be an outsider looking in. Information was flowing freely between victim and both law enforcement and advocates. . . . The nighttime on-call victim advocates (nova) were trained in domestic violence/sexual assault/stalking and how to work with law enforcement and their guidelines. Money was also used to purchase digital recorders and to do stalking victim focus groups to see where our gaps are.

—City of La Crosse, Wisconsin

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Funding has allowed our office to more thoroughly review cases for stalking charges. The paralegal funded through this grant reviews cases charged as harassment, telephone misuse, and other similar charges that may be part of an overall stalking pattern. After interviewing the victim, she is able to determine if stalking charges can be filed. In addition, she discusses a safety plan with victims and refers them to appropriate services to enhance safety.

—Harford County State's Attorney's Office, Maryland

Training law enforcement and prosecutors in the identification, investigation, and prosecution of stalking crimes, including stalking via technology, is critical and has been supported by the following STOP Program-funded agencies:

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Program funding has allowed the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office to implement the Stalking and Threat Assessment Team (STAT), a specialized vertical prosecution unit in which specially selected and trained deputy district attorneys handle stalking cases from initial filing through the ultimate disposition of the case in the criminal courts. Since 1998, funding has allowed the first centralized unit created within the district attorney's office dedicated solely to the vertical prosecution and investigation of stalking and criminal threat cases. The STAT deputy district attorney receives specialized training to develop an expertise in the prosecution of stalking and criminal threat cases. In addition, STOP Program funding enables the STAT deputy district attorney to attend the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP) conference every year. By attending the ATAP conference, the STAT deputy district attorney is able to network with stalking and threat assessment experts throughout California and the remainder of the United States. Most importantly, the STOP-funded STAT deputy district attorney serves as an advisor and trainer for other law enforcement agencies, community-based service providers who work with domestic violence and stalking victims, and Victim Impact Program (VIP) deputies who are assigned throughout the Los Angeles County district attorney's office.

—Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, California

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Training on the use of technology in intimate partner stalking provided FASTT [Family Abuse and Stalking Training Team] detectives with new skills necessary to investigate cases involving the use of telephones, computers, and the Internet. Knowledge gained in the grant-funded training was used to identify and locate suspects sending threatening phone or computer messages, and to provide technological safety planning for victims.

—City of Albuquerque/Albuquerque Police Department, New Mexico

SUBGRANTEE PERSPECTIVE

Finally, the [STOP] program funding allows the Domestic Violence Deputy Prosecutor the opportunity to provide training sessions to local law enforcement officers focusing on: the unique and complex issues involved in prosecuting domestic violence cases; the resources available to aid the officers in assisting victims; new, pertinent legislation enacted; and most importantly, the specific types of evidence critical to ensuring a conviction. This type of training is vital in any domestic violence case, but especially in situations where the victim recants due to fear of retaliation from her abuser. The training sessions also educate law enforcement officers about the specific types of evidence needed to ensure a stalking conviction, such as how to obtain and preserve evidence, such as phone records, messages sent via texting, or Internet communications. The training also ensures officers will be informed of community resources to offer the victim who is in fear for her safety.

—Morgan County Prosecutor's Office, Indiana

STOP Program funds were used to develop, enlarge, and strengthen programs that address stalking by an average of 286, or 12 percent, of subgrantees. Prosecution offices funded under the STOP Program reported disposing of a total of 2,762 stalking cases in 2009 and 2010, which constituted 1.3 percent of all cases disposed of. The conviction rate for all stalking cases (including ordinance, misdemeanor, felony, and stalking homicide) was 71 percent. Training on stalking issues was provided by an average of 355 subgrantees or 36 percent of those using funds for training. Training topics included overview and dynamics of stalking, available services, and relevant statutes and codes.

Remaining Areas of Need

STOP administrators are asked to report on the most significant areas of unmet need in their states, for victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and for offender accountability. In their reports for calendar year 2010, administrators regularly cited the following as remaining unmet needs:

- ▶ Maintaining/expanding core services to victims/survivors in an uncertain economic climate
- ▶ Offender accountability
- ▶ Training of law enforcement and the judiciary
- ▶ Services for underserved populations, especially immigrant and limited English proficiency victims/survivors
- ▶ Improving the economic stability of victims/survivors
- ▶ Improving coordinated community response among victim service providers and the criminal justice system, especially for sexual assault
- ▶ Providing services for victims in geographically isolated areas

STOP administrators report that subgrantees are concerned about how to maintain and expand existing core services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking in an uncertain economic climate. Recent cutbacks in local and state budgets have threatened the stability of some victim-services programs.

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

A deteriorating economy and significant reductions in federal, state, and local support have resulted in chronic staff turnover, compromised services, and even program closures, particularly in rural areas of the state and in areas with increasing ethnic diversity.

—STOP administrator, Virginia

STOP administrators frequently discussed the lack of offender accountability in their states, noting that providing victims/survivors with services to put their lives back together only solves part of the problem. Further training is considered a critical need, as is providing adequate legal services for victims/survivors involved in family court cases:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

There is a critical need to train law enforcement officers on the dynamics of domestic violence. As officers are called out repeatedly to the same address on domestic violence calls over and over again, they become less likely to render assistance and often, will cite both parties, as the officer decides to "let the courts sort it out." A charge of domestic violence, even if dismissed, can substantially hinder the victim as she tries to access services. Also, due to gaps in the judicial system, repeat offenders are often 'allowed' to violate in different jurisdictions, knowing that the likelihood of being found out is almost non-existent. If courts, prosecutors and judges had access to this information, repeat offenders could be in jeopardy of substantial jail time because domestic violence charges can be enhanced with each and every conviction. But without this information, prosecutors lack the evidence necessary to request jail time for the offender.

—STOP administrator, Utah

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

The judiciary continues to resist holding offenders accountable to the full extent of their power. When offenders violate protection orders, for example, law enforcement officers know that few judges will act swiftly and decisively to uphold the court order. In a state with no laws restricting the use of firearms—judges are reluctant to act beyond the basic notification requirement of the Violence Against Women Act. They rarely take aggressive action to remove guns/ammunition from prohibited persons as a result of a protection order, many times assigning responsibility for the firearms to a relative.

—STOP administrator, Vermont

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

There is a desperate need for offender accountability. There are many cases that do not make it to court, and in part, this is due to the victim not testifying. This goes back to educating law enforcement and prosecutors [on] the dynamics of such crimes. Many times victims will not testify because they are being threatened by the offender. If an investigation is done properly, the prosecution should be able to move forward based [on] evidence and statements collected at the time of crime, regardless if the victim testifies (evidence-based prosecution). In the cases that do make it to trial, many offenders are receiving deferred judgments. This sends the message that there are no consequences for their actions, and does not provide any deterrent of future behavior. Finally, there is a need for legislation change regarding no-contact orders. As it stands now, a victim cannot gain a civil protection order against an offender who is an acquaintance or a stranger.

—STOP administrator, Iowa

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Survivors of domestic violence need pro bono and affordable attorneys to work on a variety of legal issues, including orders of protection, divorce/custody proceedings, child support actions, landlord/tenant cases, immigration, juvenile court cases regarding child custody, and government benefits. The caseload of Legal Services and Legal Aid offices in Missouri cannot handle all of the needs of those who seek their services. Merely obtaining protection orders is not sufficient to ensure victim safety and does not represent the breadth of the legal needs of survivors of sexual assault, domestic assault and stalking.

—STOP administrator, Missouri

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Many victims prefer to access a less punitive civil system for legal relief and since the majority of battered women have children, it is often necessary for them to look to family court for help with issues of custody and support. New York State needs to address the problem of offenders using custody proceedings to continue power and control dynamics, particularly in family court. Accordingly, family court probation practices must address concerns for victim safety and offender accountability. This is increasingly important as New York moves toward the creative implementation of integrated domestic violence courts, consolidating civil and criminal court actions.

—*STOP administrator, New York*

Focus groups with victims/survivors in Ohio demonstrated that some domestic violence victims/survivors do not know where to turn for help with an abusive relationship. A lack of awareness of support services, coupled with a lack of availability of long-term services to ensure economic stability, makes it difficult for victims/survivors to leave an abusive relationship:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Specifically, victims lack information about the availability of services. Victims repeatedly stated they were not sure where to seek assistance except for calling the police. If they chose not to call the police, they turned to family and friends; and if they did not have that support, they remained in the abusive relationship. Housing, counseling, job placement, legal/court advocacy, and access to interpreters were mentioned time after time by victims as services and resources lacking in their communities. In addition, participants expressed a need for extended length of shelter stays, and improved responses from law enforcement. . . . [R]egardless of agency type or county size, services such as financial assistance to victims, housing, public transportation, child care, job training, and job placement are all lacking in some communities. Housing, especially shelters, is more likely to be sufficient at the initial stage to meet the immediate needs of victims. However, as victims move through the process, meeting housing needs becomes more challenging, and housing is deficient at the intermediate and long-term stages for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

—*STOP administrator, Ohio*

STOP administrators also indicate that victims/survivors in the rural areas of their states continue to struggle with challenges, both economic and geographic:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Because South Dakota is a predominantly rural state, many victims have to overcome transportation obstacles to access services. This does not only include the service of safe shelter, but also includes filing protection orders, accessing counselors and support groups, and obtaining medical advocacy. Victim services programs report their agencies do not have the necessary funding to provide all of the requested transportation. Many victims do not have access to reliable transportation, as public transportation is not available in many rural communities. In order to file a protection order, victims may have to travel 45 or more miles.

—STOP administrator, South Dakota

STOP administrators frequently mentioned the unmet needs of underserved populations, particularly immigrant victims/survivors and those with limited English proficiency. Access to civil legal representation for immigration issues is paramount for many immigrant victims/survivors, who face even greater challenges in leaving an abusive relationship. Those with limited English proficiency encounter significant difficulties navigating and accessing services and legal remedies:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Consistent translator availability is a big issue within the justice system as a whole. Culturally appropriate responses within the justice system are hard to find outside of OVW-funded "special" projects and sometimes even within OVW projects. We believe that systems are beginning to understand the need for these services but see the financial restrictions as insurmountable.

—STOP administrator, Wisconsin

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Programs all over the state are continuing to report higher numbers of people using their services who do not speak English or do not speak English well. Several programs have hired bilingual and/or bicultural advocates, but making services fully accessible to non-English-speaking persons still presents a huge challenge.

—STOP administrator, Virginia

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Language presents barriers. Children are still being used as interpreters for their parents. Utah has been deemed as an 'English-only state' which makes it difficult for victims to secure protective orders.

—STOP administrator, Utah

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

A second need expressed is the need for culturally-competent services in underserved populations such, but not limited to, Hispanic, Burmese, Arabic and African populations. There are several counties in our state that have a [large] immigrant population, making bilingual services and legal assistance imperative. Enhancing services to include more resources and language options would decrease barriers that often prevent underserved populations from reaching out for assistance. It is important to note that these services are not limited to victim-service programs. Victims need culturally-competent services in the courtroom and health care settings, as well.

—STOP administrator, Iowa

Improving the response to sexual assault, in terms of the criminal justice system and victim services, continues to be a priority for many STOP administrators:

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

Prosecution faces the largest challenges. A well-documented shortage of prosecutors continues to erode the ability of DA's [district attorneys] and ADA's [assistant district attorneys] to effectively charge and prosecute crimes of violence against women. Sexual assault [cases are] particularly hurt by this process as less experienced prosecutors either lose cases or don't charge them in the first place.

—STOP administrator, Wisconsin

ADMINISTRATOR PERSPECTIVE

For sexual assault, there is a need for training personnel from both the criminal justice system and non-government, non-profit organizations. There is a need for a coordinated sexual assault response as well as a need for an appropriate interview site for victims of sexual assault.

—STOP administrator, Hawaii

STOP Program Aggregate Accomplishments

This section presents aggregate data reflecting the activities and accomplishments funded by the STOP Program in all states, all five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia in 2009 and 2010.

STOP Program staff members provide training and victim services and engage in law enforcement, prosecution, court, and probation activities to increase victim safety and offender accountability.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for staff:⁴⁸ **2,164** (94 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 10. Full-time equivalent staff funded by STOP Program in 2009 and 2010

Staff	2009		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All staff	2,785	100	2,661	100
Victim advocate (nongovernmental)	816	29.3	734	27.6
Program coordinator	333	11.9	277	10.4
Prosecutor	266	9.5	268	10.1
Law enforcement officer	264	9.5	260	9.8
Counselor	183	6.6	172	6.5
Victim assistant (governmental)	177	6.4	262	9.8
Legal advocate	153	5.5	130	4.9
Support staff	140	5.0	108	4.1
Attorney	102	3.7	87	3.3
Administrator	101	3.6	85	3.2
Trainer	50	1.8	59	2.2
Investigator (prosecution-based)	47	3.0	51	1.9
Sexual assault nurse examiner/sexual assault forensic examiner (SANE/SAFE)	42	1.5	49	1.8
Paralegal	32	1.2	25	.9
Probation officer/offender monitor	29	1.0	25	.9
Court personnel	19	.7	27	1.0
Information technology staff	5	.2	8	.3
Translator/interpreter	4	.2	6	.2
Other	23	.8	32	1.2

⁴⁸ Averages, unless otherwise indicated, are for one reporting period, which is one calendar year.

Training

STOP Program subgrantees provide training to professionals on issues relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking to improve their response to victims/survivors and increase offender accountability. These professionals include law enforcement officers, health and mental health providers, domestic violence and sexual assault program staff, staff in social services and advocacy organizations, prosecutors, and court personnel.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for training: **977** (43 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Total number⁴⁹ of people trained: **490,453**
- ▶ Total number of training events: **24,451**

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

People trained	2009 & 2010	
	Number	Percent
All people trained	490,453	100
Law enforcement officers	148,657	30.3
Multidisciplinary	67,164	13.7
Victim advocates	51,599	10.5
Health professionals	33,073	6.7
Volunteers	21,392	4.4
Educators	19,619	4.0
Social service organization staff	18,816	3.8
Court personnel	18,516	3.8
Government agency staff	12,884	2.6
Prosecutors	11,731	2.4
Corrections personnel	11,172	2.3
Mental health professionals	11,037	2.3
Attorneys/law students	10,082	2.1
Faith-based organization staff	10,031	2.0
Victim assistants	7,750	1.6
Sexual assault nurse examiners/sexual assault forensic examiners	7,105	1.4
Advocacy organization staff	6,267	1.3
Elder organization staff	3,583	.7
Legal services staff	2,494	.5
Disability organization staff	2,483	.5

⁴⁹ "Total" numbers are totals for 2009 and 2010.

Table 11. People trained with STOP Program funds in 2009 and 2010

People trained	2009 & 2010	
	Number	Percent
Military command staff	2,372	.5
Immigrant organization staff	1,670	.3
Batterer intervention program (BIP) staff	1,565	.3
Substance abuse organization staff	1,497	.3
Tribal government/Tribal government agency staff	1,367	.3
Translators/interpreters	816	.2
Supervised visitation and exchange center staff	447	.1
Sex offender treatment providers	426	.1
Other	4,838	1.0

The most common topics of training events were overviews of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking; advocate response; safety planning for victims/survivors; law enforcement response; confidentiality; domestic violence statutes/codes; and protection orders.

Coordinated Community Response

STOP administrators engage in an inclusive and collaborative planning process to improve their state's responses to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. STOP Program subgrantees closely interact with other community agencies or organizations; these CCR activities include providing and receiving victim/survivor referrals, consulting, providing technical assistance, and/or attending meetings with other agencies or organizations.

Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2009

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Advocacy organization	69	140	275	22	254	189
Batterer intervention program	113	298	367	82	369	297
Corrections	157	356	512	64	532	381
Court	707	627	262	217	504	400
Domestic violence organization	882	538	332	334	811	423

Table 12a. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2009

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Educational institution/organization	77	247	482	44	330	328
Faith-based organization	73	230	518	26	285	331
Government agency	304	445	366	54	381	316
Health/mental health organization	292	629	554	75	634	415
Law enforcement	916	620	315	304	776	471
Legal organization	328	522	418	70	425	328
Prosecutor's office	569	590	370	287	642	387
Sex offender management	16	46	159	9	113	109
Sexual assault organization	360	402	468	172	565	403
Social service organization	458	600	380	98	681	380
Tribal government/tribal government agency	11	53	139	11	82	88
Other	30	48	41	12	90	43

Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2010

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
Advocacy organization	65	150	242	27	211	188
Batterer intervention program	90	263	361	87	361	267
Corrections	139	340	468	68	486	326
Court	672	600	272	221	488	383
Domestic violence organization	826	561	310	316	769	448
Educational institution/organization	67	294	451	43	327	320
Faith-based organization	55	251	471	27	257	303
Government agency	287	432	312	57	363	270
Health/mental health	268	611	517	80	573	411

Table 12b. STOP Program-funded referrals/consultations/technical assistance to and meetings with community agencies in 2010

Agency/organization	Victim/survivor referrals, consultations, technical assistance			Meetings		
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
organization						
Law enforcement	887	608	311	331	731	440
Legal organization	284	507	376	53	390	329
Prosecutor's office	551	560	367	264	615	355
Sex offender management	19	49	161	12	111	120
Sexual assault organization	324	391	455	161	553	407
Social service organization	399	68	346	86	652	385
Tribal government/tribal government agency	9	48	142	7	85	78
Other	42	39	47	11	86	42

Policies

STOP Program subgrantees develop and implement policies and procedures directed at more effectively preventing, identifying, and responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for policies/protocols: **452** (20 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 13a. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2009

Policy/protocol	2009 Subgrantees using funds (N = 477)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)	185	38.8
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)	181	37.9
Confidentiality (victim services)	158	33.1
Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)	140	29.4
Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)	137	28.7
Mandatory training standards (victim services)	129	27.0
Identifying primary aggressor	119	24.9
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)	117	24.5
Immediate access to protection order information	116	24.3
Protection order enforcement	114	23.9

Table 13b. Use of STOP Program funds to revise or implement policies or protocols in 2010

Policy/protocol	2010 Subgrantees using funds (N = 426)	
	Number	Percent
Appropriate response to underserved populations (victim services)	161	37.8
Providing information to victims/survivors about victim services (law enforcement)	162	38.0
Confidentiality (victim services)	151	35.4
Informing victims about crime victims compensation and victim impact statements (victim services)	138	32.4
Sexual assault response and protocols (law enforcement)	114	26.8
Mandatory training standards (victim services)	112	26.3
Identifying primary aggressor (law enforcement)	105	24.6
Appropriate response to victims/survivors who are elderly or have disabilities (victim services)	117	27.5
Immediate access to protection order information (law enforcement)	110	25.8
Protection order enforcement (law enforcement)	110	25.8

Products

STOP Program subgrantees develop and/or revise a variety of products for distribution, including brochures, manuals, and training curriculums and materials. The products are designed to provide standardized information to professionals, community agencies/organizations, and victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for products: **466** (20 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Number of products developed or revised:⁵⁰ **2,825**

STOP Program subgrantees developed, revised, distributed, and/or translated 636 products in the following 27 languages in 2009 and 2010:

⁵⁰ These products included brochures, manuals, and training curriculums and materials, including those developed for websites.

American Sign Language	English	Nepali
Amharic	French	Polish
Arabic	Gujarati	Portuguese
Bengali	Haitian	Punjabi
Bosnian	Hindi	Russian
Braille	Japanese	Somali
Burmese	Khmer	Spanish
Chinese	Korean	Urdu
Creole	Mandarin	Vietnamese

Data Collection and Communication Systems

STOP Program subgrantees develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems relating to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking against women. These systems link police, prosecution, and the courts for the purposes of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for data collection and communication systems: **247** (11 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 14. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for data collection activities and/or communication systems in 2009 and 2010

Activity	Subgrantees using funds 2009 (N = 245)		Subgrantees using funds 2010 (N = 249)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Manage data collection and communication	150	61.2	137	55.0
Share information with other community partners	108	44.1	108	43.4
Expand existing data collection/communication systems	90	36.7	100	40.1
Purchase computers/other equipment	59	24.1	66	26.5
Develop new data collection/communication systems	52	21.2	51	20.5

NOTE: Total number of subgrantees reporting data collection activities is higher than subgrantees using funds for data collection, since subgrantees report on all types of activities that apply.

Table 15. Most frequently reported purposes of data collection and/or communication systems in 2009 and 2010

Purpose	2009	2010
	Subgrantees reporting	Subgrantees reporting
Case management	149	143
Protection orders	114	117
Evaluation/outcome measures	111	111
Arrests/charges	108	119
Incident reports	107	114
Violations of protection orders	98	90

Specialized Units

STOP Program subgrantees develop, train, and/or expand specialized units of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges and other court staff, and probation officers who are responsible for handling sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for specialized units: **532** (23 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 16a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2009

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	19	12	3	3
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	247	278	37	43
Train a specialized unit	42	23	4	7
Other	8	3	1	1

Table 16b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for specialized unit activities in 2010

Activity	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Develop a new unit	23	19	3	4
Support, expand, or coordinate an existing unit	269	278	45	49
Train a specialized unit	52	26	5	4
Other	5	4	1	1

Table 17a. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2009

Victimization	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Sexual assault	180	189	22	19
Domestic violence/dating violence	267	283	37	40
Stalking	180	198	22	22

Table 17b. Number of specialized units addressing type of victimization in 2010

Victimization	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Sexual assault	224	218	39	30
Domestic violence/dating violence	287	292	50	50
Stalking	197	213	35	29

System Improvement

To more effectively respond to the needs of victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, STOP Program subgrantees engage in system improvement activities. These include convening meetings between tribal and nontribal entities, making language lines available, translating forms and documents, and making facilities safer.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for system improvement: **227** (10 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 18a. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2009

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	80	42	30	17	14
Interpreters	84	27	21	24	3
Language lines	24	4	2	2	1
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	18	13	7	6	6
Safety audits	17	7	4	4	3
Security personnel or equipment	14	6	3	2	0
Translation of forms and documents	80	16	13	15	3
Other	27	17	16	15	8

Table 18b. Subgrantees reporting use of STOP Program funds for system improvement activities in 2010

Activity	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Court	Probation/parole
Evaluation	69	36	26	19	14
Interpreters	59	19	15	18	1
Language lines	14	5	3	1	0
Meetings between tribal and nontribal entities	16	9	4	4	1
Safety audits	16	10	3	5	3
Security personnel or equipment	11	8	1	3	1
Translation of forms and documents	71	20	14	9	2
Other	24	16	16	14	8

Victim Services

During the two 12-month reporting periods, an average of 1,542 subgrantees (67 percent) used funds for victim services in 2009 and 2010. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to an average of 452,893 victims/survivors (99 percent of those seeking services) to help them become and remain safe from violence; only 1 percent of victims/survivors seeking services from funded programs did not receive services from those programs. (See Tables 19a, 19b, 20, and 21 for information on the level of service provided, the types of victims/survivors served, and the reasons victims/survivors were partially served or not served by subgrantees in 2009 and 2010.)

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for victim service: **1,542** (67 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, by level of service and type of victimization

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence / dating violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	482,507	100	412,907	100	58,784	100	10,816	100
Not served	6,242	1.3	5,363	1.3	737	1.3	142	1.3

Table 19a. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009, by level of service and type of victimization

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence / dating violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Served	461,545	95.7	394,425	95.5	56,722	96.5	10,398	96.1
Partially Served	14,720	3.1	13,119	3.2	1,325	2.3	276	2.6

NOTE: Partially served victims/survivors received some, but not all, of the services they sought through STOP Program-funded programs. Some of these victims/survivors may have received other requested services from other agencies.

Table 19b. Provision of victim services by STOP Program subgrantees in 2010, by level of service and type of victimization

Level of service	All victims		Domestic violence / dating violence victims		Sexual assault victims		Stalking victims	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All seeking services	435,451	100	371,471	100	53,812	100	9,692	100
Not served	5,930	1.4	5,386	1.4	481	.9	63	.6
Served	413,308	94.9	352,344	94.9	51,272	95.3	9,692	95.3
Partially Served	16,213	3.7	3,741	3.7	2,059	3.8	413	4.1

NOTE: Partially served victims/survivors received some, but not all, of the services they sought through STOP Program-funded programs. Some of these victims/survivors may have received other requested services from other agencies.

Table 20. Victims/survivors receiving services from STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010, by type of victimization

Type of victimization	Victims/survivors served			
	2009		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All victimizations	476,265	100	429,521	100
Domestic violence / dating violence	407,544	85.6	366,085	85.2
Sexual assault	58,047	12.2	53,331	12.4
Stalking	10,674	2.2	10,105	2.4

Table 21. Most frequently reported reasons victims/survivors were not served or were partially served by STOP Program subgrantees⁵¹

Reason	Subgrantees reporting	
	2009	2010
Program reached capacity	147	133
Did not meet statutory requirements	144	131
Services not appropriate for victim/survivor	136	121
Conflict of interest	119	110
Program rules not acceptable to victim/survivor	111	87
Services inappropriate or inadequate for victims/survivors with mental health issues	110	94
Transportation	100	64
Program unable to provide service due to limited resources/priority-setting	88	98

Demographics of Victims/survivors Served

Of the average 452,893 victims/survivors served in 2009 and 2010 for whom demographic information was reported, the majority were white (55 percent), female (91 percent), and age 25–59 (67 percent).

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

Characteristics	Victims/survivors receiving services			
	2009		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian and/or Alaska Native	9,788	2.3	8,549	2.2
Asian	7,026	1.6	5,582	1.4
Black or African-American	98,847	23.0	89,701	22.7
Hispanic or Latino	76,676	17.8	75,119	19.0
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3,743	.9	2,010	.5
White	238,615	55.5	215,493	54.6
Unknown	46,149	NA	34,988	NA
Gender				
Female	419,436	91.0	382,111	91.0
Male	41,337	9.0	37,616	9.0
Unknown	15,492	NA	9,794	NA
Age				
0–12	NA		NA	
13–17	22,387	5.2	19,961	5.1
18–24	106,970	24.8	94,761	24.2

⁵¹ Although STOP subgrantees do not report a reason for not serving or for partially serving individual victims/survivors, they report reasons for not serving or partially serving victims/survivors in general by checking all reasons that apply.

Table 22. Demographic characteristics of victims/survivors served by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

Characteristics	Victims/survivors receiving services			
	2009		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25–59	285,166	66.1	261,941	66.9
60+	16,713	3.9	14,900	3.8
Unknown	45,029	NA	37,958	NA
Other demographics				
People with disabilities	24,919	5.2	24,717	5.8
People with limited English proficiency	39,158	8.2	38,791	9.0
People who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	20,981	4.4	21,973	5.1
People who live in rural areas	119,871	25.2	117,884	27.4

NA = not applicable

NOTE: Percentages for race/ethnicity, gender, and age are based on the number of victims/survivors for whom the information was known. STOP Program subgrantees provided services to 452,893 victims/survivors. Because victims/survivors may have identified with more than one race/ethnicity, the total number reported in race/ethnicity may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors served.

Table 23a. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2009

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence / dating violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	273,573	72.4	10,794	21.2	6,118	46.8
Other family or household member	38,861	10.3	12,226	24.0	669	5.1
Dating relationship	59,520	15.8	5,682	11.2	2,287	17.5
Acquaintance	5,182	1.4	15,548	30.6	1,797	13.8
Stranger	719	.2	6,633	13.0	525	4
Unknown	36,109	NA	12,218	NA	1,668	NA
Total (excluding unknown)	377,855	100	50,883	100	11,396	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims/survivors may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships in any one victimization category may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors reported as served for that victimization.

Table 23b. Relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds in 2010

Relationship to offender	Domestic violence		Sexual assault		Stalking	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current/former spouse or intimate partner	239,764	70.3	10,120	21.6	5,215	50.4
Other family or household member	34,425	10.1	10,712	22.9	704	6.8
Dating relationship	61,745	18.1	5,218	11.2	1,797	17.4
Acquaintance	4,931	1.4	15,023	32.1	1,953	18.9
Stranger	420	.1	5,716	12.2	674	6.5
Unknown	31,952	NA	10,643	NA	1,907	NA
Total (excluding unknown)	341,285	100	46,789	100	10,343	100

NA = not applicable

NOTE: The percentages in each victimization category are based on the total number of known relationships to offender reported in that category. Because victims/survivors may have been abused by more than one offender and may have experienced more than one type of victimization, the number of reported relationships in any one victimization category may be higher than the total number of victims/survivors reported as served for that victimization.

Types of Services Provided to Victims/survivors

STOP Program subgrantees provide an array of services to victims/survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. These services include victim advocacy (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed resources or services, such as material goods and resources, health care, education, finances, transportation, child care, employment, and housing), crisis intervention, counseling/support groups, and legal advocacy (help navigating the criminal and/or civil legal systems). Victim advocacy was the service most frequently provided by STOP Program subgrantees. In addition to the services listed in Table 24, STOP Program subgrantees routinely provide safety planning, referrals, and information to victims/survivors as needed.

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

Type of service	Victims/survivors served			
	2009 (N = 476,265)		2010 (N = 429,521)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Victim/survivor advocacy	215,088	45.2	206,486	48.1
Crisis intervention	211,182	44.3	193,327	45.0
Criminal justice advocacy/court accompaniment	158,060	33.2	139,512	32.5
Civil legal advocacy/court accompaniment	130,056	27.3	113,854	26.5
Counseling services/support group	115,725	24.3	106,067	24.7

Table 24. Victim services provided by STOP Program subgrantees in 2009 and 2010

Type of service	Victims/survivors served			
	2009 (N = 476,265)		2010 (N = 429,521)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Civil legal assistance	25,273	5.3	24,401	5.7
Transportation	23,249	4.9	23,209	5.4
Hospital/clinic/other medical response	15,516	3.3	14,570	3.4
Language services	14,436	3.0	16,979	4.0
Forensic exam	9,634	2.0	9,932	2.3
Other victim service	3,078	.6	1,703	.4

NOTE: Detail does not add to the total number of victims/survivors because an individual victim/survivor may have been reported as receiving more than one type of service.

Number receiving shelter services and number of bed nights in 2009 and 2010:

- ▶ An annual average of **20,759** victims/survivors and **18,871** family members received a total of **1,601,685** emergency shelter bed nights.
- ▶ An annual average of **755** victims/survivors and **841** family members received a total of **323,444** transitional housing bed nights.

Total number of hotline calls in 2009 and 2010:

- ▶ From victims/survivors: **679,049**
- ▶ From all callers, including victims/survivors: **1,202,710**

Total number of victim-witness notification/outreach activities: **350,904**

Protection Orders

The STOP Program funds activities that provide support to victims/survivors seeking protection orders, including providing advocacy in the courtroom, increasing police enforcement of protection order violations, and training advocates and judges on the effectiveness and use of orders. STOP Program subgrantees, whether they are providing victim services or engaging in criminal justice activities, are in a position to provide assistance to victims/survivors in the protection order process. In 2009 and 2010, STOP Program-funded victim services, law enforcement, and prosecution staff assisted domestic violence victims/survivors in obtaining 372,197 temporary and final protection orders.

Table 25. Protection orders granted with assistance of STOP Program-funded staff in 2009 and 2010

Provider	Total	2009		2010	
		Temp	Final	Temp	Final
All providers	345,767	112,366	76,214	94,632	62,555
Victim services staff	254,649	80,416	60,057	65,548	48,628
Law enforcement	65,010	20,989	12,003	21,198	10,820
Prosecution	26,108	10,961	4,154	7,886	3,107

An average of 473 (48 percent of all subgrantees using funds for training) addressed the issue of protection order enforcement, and an average of 91 developed or implemented policies and protocols relating to protection orders in 2009 and 2010. These policies addressed the issues of protection order enforcement, immediate access to protection orders, violation of protection orders, full faith and credit, and mutual restraining orders. STOP Program subgrantees also used funds for data collection and communication systems for tracking and sharing information about protection orders: 120 subgrantees reported this, making it the third most frequently reported purpose for these systems.

Criminal Justice

The STOP Program promotes a coordinated community approach that includes law enforcement, prosecution, courts, probation, victim services, and public and private community resources. Criminal justice data in this report reflect only those activities supported with STOP Program funds.

Law Enforcement

The response and attitude of law enforcement officers can significantly influence whether victims/survivors report sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking offenses, and whether appropriate evidence is collected to enable prosecutors to bring successful cases. Arrest, accompanied by a thorough investigation and meaningful sanctions, demonstrates to offenders that they have committed a serious crime and communicates to victims/survivors that they do not have to endure an offender's abuse.

Tables 26a and 26b summarize STOP Program-funded law enforcement activities during 2009 and 2010. The most frequently reported activities were case investigations and incident reports.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for law enforcement: **296** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 26a. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2009⁵²

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Cases/incidents investigated	3,701	72,961	1,636	78,298
Incident reports	3,802	72,203	1,404	77,409
Calls for assistance	5,288	66,146	1,855	73,289
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	1,474	31,847	573	33,894
Arrests	958	29,618	439	31,015
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	348	20,000	366	20,714
Enforcement of warrants	400	6,420	219	7,039
Arrests for violation of protection order	64	3,126	60	3,250
Dual arrests	NA	1,456	NA	1,456
Arrests for violation of bail bond	247	908	13	1,168
Forensic medical evidence	886	NA	NA	886
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	7	81	2	90

NA = not applicable

Table 26b. Law enforcement activities provided with STOP Program funds in 2010⁵³

Activity	Sexual assault	Domestic violence/dating violence	Stalking	Total activities
Incident reports	3,566	72,551	2,172	78,289
Calls for assistance	3,586	71,292	1,441	76,319
Cases/incidents investigated	4,364	68,496	1,508	74,368
Referrals of cases to prosecutor	2,256	33,800	548	36,604
Arrests	1,219	26,998	410	28,627
Protection/ex parte/temporary restraining orders served	156	17,762	322	18,240
Enforcement of warrants	460	9,416	198	10,074
Arrests for violation of protection order	25	2,979	41	3,045
Forensic medical evidence	960	NA	NA	960
Dual arrests	NA	893	NA	893
Arrests for violation of bail bond	20	670	46	736
Referrals of federal firearms charges to federal prosecutor	2	22	2	26

NA = not applicable

⁵² Subgrantees may receive funds for specifically designated law enforcement activities and might not engage in the other activities referred to here. For example, a subgrantee may have received STOP Program funding to support a dedicated domestic violence detective whose only activity was to investigate cases; that subgrantee would not report on calls for assistance or incidents reports, unless those activities also were supported by STOP Program funds.

⁵³ See footnote 52.

Prosecution

After police arrest a suspect, it is usually up to the prosecutor to decide whether to prosecute the case. However, in some states and local jurisdictions, police officers both arrest and charge offenders and grand juries are responsible for deciding whether felonies will be prosecuted. Generally, city and county prosecutors handle ordinance-level offenses in municipal courts, misdemeanors in district courts, and felony offenses in superior courts.

Table 27 presents data on STOP Program-funded prosecutions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases during 2009 and 2010.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for prosecution: **294** (13 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 27. Prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence / dating violence, stalking and related cases by STOP Program-funded prosecutors in 2009 and 2010

Type of case	2009			2010		
	Total disposed	Number convicted	Percent convicted	Total disposed	Number convicted	Percent convicted
Domestic violence/dating violence ordinance	6,525	4,008	61.4	8,539	4,575	53.6
Misdemeanor domestic violence/dating violence	72,723	47,026	64.7	54,777	36,523	66.7
Felony domestic violence/dating violence	15,795	11,859	75.1	12,879	10,145	78.8
Domestic violence/dating violence homicide	78	74	94.9	54	53	98.1
Misdemeanor sexual assault	742	569	76.7	583	398	68.3
Felony sexual assault	3,515	3,094	88.0	1,979	1,545	78.1
Sexual assault homicide	6	6	100	10	9	90.0
Stalking ordinance	64	52	81.3	85	65	76.5
Misdemeanor stalking	1,107	731	66.0	832	560	67.3
Felony stalking	367	302	82.3	303	259	85.5
Stalking homicide	4	4	100	0	0	0
Violation of bail	837	721	86.1	531	467	87.9
Violation of probation or parole	4,188	3,731	89.1	2,529	2,232	88.3
Violation of protection order	9,459	6,705	70.9	7,140	4,798	67.2
Violation of other court order	609	525	86.2	913	661	72.4
Other	656	522	79.6	19	8	42.1
Total	116,675	79,929	NA	91,173	62,298	NA

Courts

Judges have two distinct roles in responding to violence against women—administrative and judicial. In their administrative role, judges are responsible for overseeing court dockets, activities, and services and for ensuring that court houses are accessible, safe, and user friendly for all who have business in the courts. In their judicial role, judges are responsible for presiding over court hearings and ensuring that due process is accorded to victims and defendants in criminal proceedings and to all parties in civil litigation. They have broad powers to hold offenders accountable and improve the safety of victims through rejecting or approving negotiated pleas, convicting or acquitting defendants in criminal cases after hearing, and rendering decisions in civil matters. They exercise significant discretion in sentencing, including whether they will allow diversion and deferred sentences. Courts may monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with conditions of both civil (e.g., protection from abuse) and criminal (e.g., probation) court orders.

Of the 15 courts (or court-based programs) that received STOP funding to conduct court activities each year,⁵⁴ 9 used STOP Program funds to conduct review hearings on offenders' compliance with conditions of probation and other court-ordered conditions:

- ▶ An annual average of **3,276** offenders were monitored in 2009 and 2010.
- ▶ A total of **11,901** individual judicial review hearings were held in 2009 and 2010.

The data in Tables 28a and 28b reflect the consequences imposed by STOP Program-funded courts for violations of probation and other court orders. In 2009, 43 percent of all violations disposed of resulted in partial or full revocation of probation; in 2010, 63 percent had this result.

- ▶ Average number of subgrantees using funds for court: **15** (1 percent of all subgrantees)

⁵⁴ Although an average of 51 courts received STOP funding in 2009 and 2010, only 15 of those courts used funds specifically for court activities. Other activities that court subgrantees conducted with STOP funding included training, CCR, policies, products, data/communication systems, security, interpreters/translators, and language lines.

Table 28a. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2009⁵⁵

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 750)	470	62.7	118	15.7	5	.7	0	0	157	20.9
New criminal behavior (N = 55)	0	0	53	96.4	2	3.6	0	0	0	0
Failure to attend BIP (N = 450)	296	65.8	115	25.6	22	4.9	2	.4	15	3.3
Other conditions (N = 869)	36	4.1	631	72.6	202	23.2	0	0	0	0

NOTE: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 28b. Disposition of violations of probation and other court orders by STOP Program-funded courts in 2010⁵⁶

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 122)	3	2.5	77	63.1	21	17.2	0	0	21	17.2
New criminal behavior (N = 108)	0	0	73	67.6	5	4.6	30	27.8	0	0
Failure to attend BIP (N = 417)	214	51.3	111	26.6	57	13.7	0	0	35	8.4
Other conditions (N = 607)	2	.3	526	86.6	79	13.0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: N is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

⁵⁵ The category "Failure to attend mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)" was not included in Table 28a because of a low N (13); 77 percent of the dispositions for this violation category resulted in partial or full revocation.

⁵⁶ The category "Failure to attend other mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP)" was not included in Table 28b because of a low N (35); 60 percent of the dispositions for this violation category resulted in partial or full revocation.

Probation

Probation officers monitor offenders to review progress and compliance with court orders. They may meet with offenders in person, by telephone, or via unscheduled surveillance. If a probationer violates any terms of the probation, the officer has the power to return the probationer to court for a violation hearing, which could result in a verbal reprimand or warning, a fine, additional conditions imposed, a short period of incarceration (i.e., partial probation revocation), or full revocation of probation. As arrests of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking offenders have increased, probation and parole officers have adopted policies and practices specifically targeted to offenders who commit violent crimes against women.

The average number of offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff during 2009 and 2010 was 3,921; of those, 3,658 were being supervised for domestic violence or dating violence offenses, 248 for sexual assault offenses, and 16 for stalking offenses. These offenders received a total of 108,743 contacts, as shown in Table 29. In addition to offender monitoring, probation officers also contact victims/survivors as an additional strategy to increase victim safety. An annual average of 1,412 victims/survivors received a total of 8,869 contacts from probation officers funded under the STOP Program during 2009 and 2010.

- ▶ Average number of grantees using funds for probation: **24** (1 percent of all subgrantees)

Table 29. Offender monitoring by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009 and 2010, by type and number of contacts

Type of contact	2009		2010	
	Number of offenders	Number of contacts	Number of offenders	Number of contacts
Face-to-face	4,123	28,676	2,341	26,398
Telephone	2,805	17,834	1,995	17,247
Unscheduled surveillance	1,695	10,796	1,283	7,792

- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation without violations: **655** (60 percent of those completing probation)
- ▶ Average number of offenders completing probation with violations: **440** (40 percent)⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Data from one subgrantee that reported on offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded pretrial services in 2010 was excluded from these computations. The number of offenders completing pretrial supervision without violations for this subgrantee was 333 (97 percent of those in supervision who completed during 2010) and the number completing with violations was 10 (3 percent).

The data in Tables 30a and 30b reflect the dispositions of violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009 and 2010. Offenders received partial or full revocation when protection orders were violated (an average of 72 percent), when they failed to attend batterer intervention programs (60 percent), or when they engaged in new criminal behavior (56 percent).

Table 30a. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2009

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 110)	4	3.6	97	88.2	9	8.2	0	0	0	0
New criminal behavior (N = 266)	4	1.5	207	77.8	24	9.0	21	7.9	10	3.8
Failure to attend BIP (N = 372)	52	14.0	245	65.9	49	13.2	20	5.4	6	1.6
Failure to attend MOT (N = 107)	8	7.5	50	46.7	19	17.8	15	14.0	15	14.0
Other (N = 735)	108	14.7	447	60.8	112	15.2	13	1.8	55	7.5

NOTES: *N* is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding. MOT = mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP).

Table 30b. Disposition of probation violations for offenders supervised by STOP Program-funded probation staff in 2010

Violation	Verbal/written warning		Partial/full revocation of probation		Conditions added		Fine		No action taken	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protection order (N = 104)	33	31.7	56	53.8	8	7.5	0	0	7	6.6
New criminal behavior (N = 317)	171	53.9	116	36.6	15	4.7	4	1.3	11	3.4
Failure to attend BIP (N = 353)	90	25.4	191	53.8	37	10.5	12	3.4	24	6.8
Failure to attend MOT (N = 77)	4	5.2	45	58.4	23	29.9	5	6.5	0	0
Other (N = 737)	204	27.7	317	43.0	91	12.3	21	2.8	104	14.1

NOTES: *N* is the number of dispositions reported for each category of violation. One offender may have received more than one disposition per violation and may have had multiple violations in the same 12-month period. Percentages may not add to 100 percent because of rounding. MOT = mandated offender treatment (does not include BIP).

Batterer Intervention Program

- ▶ Average number of individual subgrantees using STOP Program funds for batterer intervention programs (BIP): **16** (1 percent of all subgrantees)
- ▶ Average annual number of offenders in BIP: **1,715**
- ▶ Average number of continuing offenders from last reporting period: **536**
- ▶ Average number of offenders entering during current reporting period: **1,179**

Table 31. Outcomes of offenders in STOP-funded BIP programs in 2009 and 2010

Type of outcome	2009	2010
	Number of offenders	Number of offenders
Completed program	401	629
Terminated from program	329	428
Returned to program after termination	89	78
Other ⁵⁸	53	31

⁵⁸ Other outcomes included the following: transferred, deceased, referred to other court.

References

- Alexy, E. M., Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., & Smoyak, S. A. (2005). Perceptions of cyberstalking among college students. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention, 5*(3), 279–289. doi:10.1093/brief-treatment/mhi020
- Allen, N. E., Bybee, D. I., & Sullivan, C. M. (2004). Battered women's multitude of needs: Evidence supporting the need for comprehensive advocacy. *Violence Against Women, 10*(9), 1015–1035. doi:10.1177/1077801204267658
- Allen, N. E., Javdani, S., Anderson, C. J., Rana, S., Newman, D., Todd, N., ... Davis, S. (2009). *Coordinating the criminal justice response to intimate partner violence: The effectiveness of councils in producing systems change* (NCJ 229248). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Allstate Foundation. (2006). *Escape is half the battle: National Poll on Domestic Violence*. Chicago, IL: Allstate Foundation.
- Amendola, K., Slipka, M., Hamilton, E., & Whitman, J. (2010). *The course of domestic abuse among Chicago's elderly: Risk factors, protective behaviors, and police intervention* (NCJ 232623). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for rape*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, M. (1993). A license to abuse: The impact of conditional status on female immigrants. *Yale Law Journal, 102*, 1401–1430.
- Basile, K., & Black, M. (2011). Intimate partner violence against women. In C. Renzetti, J. Edleson, & R. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women* (pp. 111–132). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009). *National crime victimization survey: Stalking victimization in the United States* (NCJ 224527). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Beaulaurier, R. L., Seff, L. R., Newman, F. L., & Dunlop, B. (2007). External barriers to help seeking for older women who experience intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(8), 747–755. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9122-y
- Belknap, J., & Sullivan, C. M. (2002). *Longitudinal study of battered women in the system: The victims' and decision-makers' perceptions, final report* (NCJ 202946). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Bell, M. E., Perez, S., Goodman, L. A., & Dutton, M. A. (2011). Battered women's perceptions of civil and criminal court helpfulness: The role of court outcome and process. *Violence Against Women, 17*(1), 71–88. doi:10.1177/1077801210393924

- Bhuyan, R., Mell, M., Senturia, K., Sullivan, M., & Shiu-Thornton, S. (2005). "Women must endure according to their karma": Cambodian immigrant women talk about domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(8), 902–921. doi:10.1177/0886260505277675
- Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., ... Stevens, M. (2011). *National intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_Report2010-a.pdf
- Bonomi, A., Anderson, M., Reid, R., Carrell, D., Fishman, P., Rivara, F., & Thompson, R. (2007). Intimate partner violence in older women. *The Gerontologist, 47*(1), 34–41.
- Breiding, M., Ziemkowski, J., & Black, M. (2009). Prevalence of rural intimate partner violence in 16 US states, 2005. *Journal of Rural Health, 25*(3), 240–246.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2006). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 2005 statistical tables: National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCJ 215244). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Button, D. M., & Payne, B. K. (2009). Training child protective services workers about domestic violence: Needs, strategies, and barriers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(3), 364–369. doi:10.1016
- Buzawa, E. S., Hotaling, G. T., Klein, A., & Byrne, J. (1999). *Response to domestic violence in a pro-active court setting* (NCJ 181427). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Camacho, C. M., & Alarid, L. F. (2008). The significance of the victim advocate for domestic violence victims in municipal court. *Violence and Victims, 23*(3), 288–300. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.3.288
- Campbell, D. W., Sharps, P. W., Gary, F., Campbell, J., & Lopez, L. M. (2002). Intimate partner violence in African American women. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 7*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nursingworld.org/>
- Campbell, R., Bybee, D., Ford, J., & Patterson, D. (2008). *Systems change analysis of SANE programs: Identifying the mediating mechanisms of criminal justice system impact* (NCJ 226497). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/226497.pdf>
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichy, L. F. (2005). The effectiveness of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs: A review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*(4), 313–329. doi:10.1177/1524838005280328
- Casey, R., Berkman, M., Stover, C. S., Gill, K., Durso, S., & Marans, S. (2007). Preliminary results of a police-advocate home-visit intervention project for victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Psychological Trauma, 6*(1), 39–49. doi:10.1300/J513v06n01_04

- Cattaneo, L. B., Cho, S., & Botuck, S. (2011). Describing intimate partner stalking over time: An effort to inform victim-centered service provision. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(17), 3428–3454.
- Cattaneo, L. B., & Goodman, L. A. (2010). Through the lens of therapeutic jurisprudence: The relationship between empowerment in the court system and well-being for intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(3), 481–502. doi:10.1177/0886260509334282
- Chester, B., Robin, R., Koss, M., Lopez, J., & Goldman, D. (1994). Grandmother dishonored: Violence against women by male partners in American Indian communities. *Violence and Victims, 9*, 249–258.
- Coker, A. L., Derrick, C., Lumpkin, J. L., Aldrich, T. E., & Oldendick, R. (2000). Help-seeking for intimate partner violence and forced sex in South Carolina. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19*(4), 316–320. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00239-7
- Coker, A. L., Flerx, V., Smith, P., Whitaker, D., Fadden, M., & Williams, M. (2007). Partner violence screening in rural health care clinics. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(7), 1319–1325.
- Committee on Law and Justice. (2001). *Crime victims with developmental disabilities: Report of a workshop*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Copel, L. C. (2006). Abuse in physically disabled women: A proposed model for understanding intimate partner violence. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care, 42*(2), 114–149.
- Crandall, C. S., & Helitzer, D. (2003). *Impact evaluation of a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program* (NCJ 203276). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Crowe, A., Sydney, L., DeMichele, M., Keilitz, S., Neal, C., Frohman, S., ... Thomas, M. (2009). *Community corrections response to domestic violence: Guidelines for practice*. Lexington, KY: American Probation & Parole Association.
- Curry, M. A., Renker, P., Hughes, R. B., Robinson-Whelen, S., Oswald, M. M., Swank, P., & Powers, L. E. (2009). Development of measures of abuse among women with disabilities and the characteristics of their perpetrators. *Violence Against Women, 15*(9), 1001–1025.
- Dalton, C., Drozd, L., & Wong, F. (2006). *Navigating custody & visitation evaluations with domestic violence: A judge's guide*. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Retrieved from http://www.stopfamilyviolence.org/sites/documents/0000/0081/NCFCJ_gui_debook_final_2006.pdf
- Davis, R., & Maxwell, C. (2002). *Preventing repeat incidents of family violence: A reanalysis of data from three field tests* (NCJ 200608). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Davis, R., Smith, B. E., & Rabbit, C. (2001). Increasing convictions in domestic violence cases: A field test in Milwaukee. *Justice System Journal, 22*(1), 61–72.
- Davis, R., & Taylor, B. (1997). A proactive response to family violence: The results of a randomized experiment. *Criminology, 35*(2), 307–333. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb00878.x
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2008). Separation/divorce sexual assault in rural Ohio: Survivors' perceptions. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 36*(1/2), 105–119.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., Schwartz, M. D., Fagen, D., & Hall, M. (2006). Separation/divorce sexual assault: The contribution of male support. *Feminist Criminology, 1*(3), 228–250. doi:10.1177/1557085106288862
- DePrince, A., Belknap, J., Labus, J., Buckingham, S., & Gover, A. (2012). The impact of victim-focused outreach on criminal legal system outcomes following police-reported intimate partner abuse. *Violence Against Women, 18*(9).
- Eastman, B. J., Bunch, S. G., Williams, A. H., & Carawan, L. W. (2007). Exploring the perceptions of domestic violence service providers in rural localities. *Violence Against Women, 13*(7), 700–716. doi:10.1177/1077801207302047
- Elliott, L., Nerney, M., Jones, T., & Friedmann, P. (2002). Barriers to screening for domestic violence. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 17*(2), 112–116. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2002.10233.x
- Erez, E., Adelman, M., & Gregory, C. (2008). Intersections of immigration and domestic violence: Voices of battered immigrant women. *Feminist Criminology, 4*(1), 32–56. doi:10.1177/1557085108325413
- Evans-Campbell, T., Lindhorst, T., Huang, B., & Walters, K. L. (2006). Interpersonal violence in the lives of urban American Indian and Alaska Native women: Implications for health, mental health, and help-seeking. *American Journal of Public Health, 96*(8), 1416–1422. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2004.054213
- Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2004). Ethnic differences in intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population: The role of alcohol use and socioeconomic status. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*(4), 303–317. doi:10.1177/1524838004269488
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2002). Being pursued: Stalking victimization in a national study of college women. *Criminology & Public Policy, 1*(2), 257–308. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2002.tb00091.x
- Fleury, R. E., Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D. I. (2000). When ending the relationship does not end the violence: Women's experiences of violence by former partners. *Violence Against Women, 6*(12), 1363–1383. doi:10.1177/10778010022183695
- Friday, P. C., Lord, V. B., Exum, M. L., & Hartman, J. L. (2006). *Evaluating the impact of a specialized domestic violence police unit* (NCJ 215916). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Frye, V., Haviland, M., & Rajah, V. (2007). Dual arrest and other unintended consequences of mandatory arrest in New York City: A brief report. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 397–405. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9094-y
- Frye, V., Hoselin, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S., & Wilt, S. (2005). Femicide in New York City 1990 to 1999. *Homicide Studies, 9*(3), 204–228. doi:10.1177/1088767904274226
- Gallaudet Research Institute. (2009). A brief summary of estimates for the size of the deaf population in the USA based on available federal data and published research. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://research.gallaudet.edu/Demographics/deaf-US.php>
- Gallup-Black, A. (2005). Twenty years of rural and urban trends in family and intimate partner homicide: Does place matter? *Homicide Studies, 9*(2), 149–173. doi:10.1177/1088767904274158
- Ganeshpanchan, Z. (2005). Domestic and gender based violence among refugees and internally displaced women. Retrieved from <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/GaneshpanchanDomesticViolenceIDPS.pdf>
- Gondolf, E. W. (2002). *Batterer intervention systems: Issues, outcomes, and recommendations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(6), 605–631.
- Gordon, J. A., & Moriarty, L. J. (2003). The effects of domestic violence batterer treatment on domestic violence recidivism: The Chesterfield County experience. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 118–134. doi:10.1177/0093854802239166
- Grama, J. L. (2000). Women forgotten: Difficulties faced by rural victims of domestic violence. *American Journal of Family Law, 14*(3), 173–189.
- Gwinn, C. (2010). *Prosecuting domestic violence cases*. Presented at the National District Attorneys Association Domestic Violence Conference, Washington, DC.
- Hamberger, L. K., Guse, C., Boerger, J., Minsky, D., Pape, D., & Folsom, C. (2004). Evaluation of a health care provider training program to identify and help partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(1), 1–11. doi:10.1023/B:JOFV.0000011578.37769.c4
- Harrell, A., Castro, J., Newmark, L., & Visher, C. (2007). *Final report on the evaluation of the judicial oversight demonstration: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Harrell, A., Schaffer, M., DeStefano, C., & Castro, J. (2006). *The evaluation of Milwaukee's Judicial Oversight Demonstration, final research report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Hartley, C. C., & Frohmann, L. (2003). *Cook County Target Abuser Call (TAC): An evaluation of a specialized domestic violence court, revised executive summary* (NCJ 202944). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Holleran, D., Beichner, D., & Spohn, C. (2010). Examining charging agreement between police and prosecutors in rape cases. *Crime & Delinquency*, 56(3), 385–413. doi:10.1177/0011128707308977
- Hulse, R. (2010). Privacy and domestic violence in court. *William & Mary Journal of Women and the Law*, 16, 237–289.
- Hunnicut, G. (2007). Female status and infant and child homicide victimization in rural and urban counties in the U.S. *Gender Issues*, 24(3), 35–50. doi:10.1007/s12147-007-9046-0
- Ingram, E. M. (2007). A comparison of help seeking between Latino and non-Latino victims of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 13(2), 159–171. doi:10.1177/1077801206296981
- Jolin, A., Feyerherm, W., Fountain, R., & Friedman, S. (1998). *Beyond arrest: The Portland, Oregon Domestic Violence Experiment, final report* (NCJ 179968). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Jones, L. (2007). The distinctive characteristics and needs of domestic violence victims in a Native American community. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(2), 113–118. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9132-9
- Keilitz, S. (2004). *Specialization of domestic violence case management in the courts: A national survey* (NCJ 199724). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Kilbane, T., & Spira, M. (2010). Domestic violence or elder abuse? Why it matters for older women. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 91(2), 165–170. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.3979
- Kilpatrick, D., Resnick, H., Ruggiero, K., Conoscenti, M., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study* (NIJ 219181). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Klein, A. (2006). *Enforcing domestic violence firearm prohibitions, a report on promising practices*. Washington, DC: Office on Violence Against Women & National Center on Full Faith and Credit.
- Klein, A. (2009). *Practical implications of current domestic violence research: For law enforcement, prosecutors and judges* (NCJ 225722). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Klein, A., & Crowe, A. (2008). Findings from an outcome examination of Rhode Island's specialized domestic violence probation supervision program: Do specialized supervision programs of batterers reduce reabuse? *Violence Against Women*, 14(2), 226–246. doi:10.1177/1077801207312633

- Klein, A., Salomon, A., Huntington, N., Dubois, J., & Lang, D. (2009). *A statewide study of stalking and its criminal justice response* (NCJ 228354). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2005). *An evaluation of Rhode Island's specialized supervision of domestic violence probationers*. Waltham, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corporation & American Probation and Parole Association.
- Klevens, J., Baker, C. K., Shelley, G. A., & Ingram, E. M. (2008). Exploring the links between components of coordinated community responses and their impact on contact with intimate partner violence services. *Violence Against Women, 14*(3), 346–358. doi:10.1177/1077801207313968
- Kraft, E. M., & Wang, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the cyberbullying and cyberstalking experiences and factors related to victimization of students at a public liberal arts college. *International Journal of Technoethics, 1*(4), 74–91.
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). *The campus sexual assault study, final report* (NCJ 221153). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>
- Krishnan, S., Hilbert, J. C., & VanLeeuwen, D. (2001). Domestic violence and help-seeking behaviors among rural women: Results from a shelter-based study. *Family & Community Health, 24*(1), 28–38.
- Kuck Jalbert, S., Rhodes, W., Kane, M., Clawson, E., Bogue, Bradford, Flygare, C., ... Guevara, M. (2011). *A multi-site evaluation of reduced probation caseload size in an evidence-based practice setting* (NCJ 234596). Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/234596.pdf>
- Labriola, M., Bradley, S., O'Sullivan, C., Rempel, M., & Moore, S. (2009). *A national portrait of domestic violence courts*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/229659.pdf>
- Lee, M. R., & Stevenson, G. D. (2006). Gender-specific homicide offending in rural areas. *Homicide Studies, 10*(1), 55–73. doi:10.1177/1088767905283640
- Leisey, M., Kupstas, P. K., & Cooper, A. (2009). Domestic violence in the second half of life. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect, 21*, 141–155.
- Logan, T. (2006). *Partner stalking: How women respond, cope, and survive*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Logan, T., Evans, L., Stevenson, E., & Jordan, C. E. (2005). Barriers to services for rural and urban survivors of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(5), 591–616. doi:10.1177/0886260504272899

- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Cole, J., & Swanberg, J. (2007). Partner stalking and implications for women's employment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(3), 268–291. doi:10.1177/0886260506295380
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Walker, R., & Faragher, T. (2006). Protective orders: Questions and conundrums. *Trauma, 7*, 174–205. doi:10.1177/1524838006288930
- Logan, T., & Walker, R. (2009). Civil protective order outcomes: Violations and perceptions of effectiveness. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(4), 675–692. doi:10.1177/0886260508317186
- Logan, T., Walker, R., Cole, J., Ratliff, S., & Leukefeld, C. (2003). Qualitative differences among rural and urban intimate violence victimization experiences and consequences: A pilot study. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(2), 83–92.
- Luna-Firebaugh, E. M. (2006). Violence against American Indian women and the Services-Training-Officers-Prosecutors Violence Against Indian Women (STOP VAIW) program. *Violence Against Women, 12*(2), 125–136. doi:10.1177/1077801205280932
- Lundy, M., & Grossman, S. F. (2009). Domestic violence service users: A comparison of older and younger women victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(5), 297–309. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9230-y
- Lyon, E., Bradshaw, J., & Menard, A. (2011). *Meeting survivors' needs through non-residential domestic violence services and supports: Results of a multi-state study* (NCJ 237328). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Macy, R. J., Nurius, P. S., Kernic, M. A., & Holt, V. L. (2005). Battered women's profiles associated with service help-seeking efforts: Illuminating opportunities for intervention. *Social Work Research, 29*(3), 137–150.
- Martin, S. L., Ray, N., Sotres-Alvares, D., Kupper, L., Moracco, K., Dickens, P., ... Gizlice, Z. (2006). Physical and sexual assault of women with disabilities. *Violence Against Women, 12*(9), 823–837. doi:10.1177/1077801206292672
- McEvoy, K. (2012). HOPE: A swift and certain process for probationers. *NIJ Journal, (269)*, 16–17.
- McFarlane, J., Abeita, J., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 20*(1-2), 51–68. doi:10.1002/bsl.477
- McFarlane, J., Malecha, A., Watson, K., Gist, J., Batten, E., Hall, I., & Smith, S. (2005). Intimate partner sexual assault against women: Frequency, health consequences, and treatment outcomes. *Obstetrics & Gynecology, 105*(1), 99–108. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000146641.98665.b6
- Meloy, M. L. (2005). The sex offender next door: An analysis of recidivism, risk factors, and deterrence of sex offenders on probation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 16*(2), 211–236. doi:10.1177/0887403404270601

- Miller, N., & Nugent, H. (2002). *Stalking laws and implementation practices: A national review for policymakers and practitioners*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse.
- Mohandie, K., Meloy, J. R., McGowan, M. G., & Williams, J. (2006). The RECON typology of stalking: Reliability and validity based upon a large sample of North American stalkers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *51*(1), 147–155. doi:10.1111/j.1556-4029.2005.00030.x
- Mueller, K., & MacKinney, A. (2006). Care across the continuum: Access to health care services in rural America. *Journal of Rural Health*, *22*, 43–49.
- Newmark, L., Rempel, M., Diffily, K., & Kane, K. M. (2001). *Specialized felony domestic violence court: Lessons on implementation and impacts from the Kings County experience* (NCJ 191861). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Nosek, N., & Hughes, R. (2006). *Violence against women with disabilities, Fact sheet #1: Findings from Studies 1992-2002*. Houston, TX: Baylor College of Medicine, Center for Research on Women with Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www.bcm.edu/crowd/index.cfm?pmid=1409#pers>
- Nowell, B., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2011). Examining multi-sector community collaboratives as vehicles for building organizational capacity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *48*(3-4), 193–207. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9364-3
- O'Dell, A. (2008). Why do police arrest victims of domestic violence? The need for comprehensive training and investigative protocols. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *15*(3), 53–73. doi:10.1080/10926770802097210
- Office of Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services. (2005). *Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System: Annual Survey Data*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2009). *Fifteen years of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, its causes and consequences*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women. Retrieved from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/women/rapporteur/docs/15YearReviewofVAWMandate.pdf>
- Otto, J., & Quinn, K. (2007). *Barriers to and promising practices for collaboration between adult protective services and domestic violence programs*. Washington, DC: National Center on Elder Abuse. Retrieved from http://www.ncea.aoa.gov/ncearoot/main_site/pdf/BarrierstoPromisingPractices.pdf
- Paranjape, A., Tucker, A., Mckenzie-Mack, L., Thompson, N., & Kaslow, N. (2007). Family violence and associated help-seeking behavior among older African American women. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *68*(2), 167–172. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2007.05.019

- Patterson, D., Greeson, M., & Campbell, R. (2009). Understanding rape survivors' decisions not to seek help from formal social systems. *Health & Social Work, 34*(2), 127–136.
- Patterson, P. (2006). Emergency medical services and the federal government's evolving role: What rural and frontier emergency medical services advocates should know. *Journal of Rural Health, 22*, 97–101.
- Payne, B., Carmody, D. C., Plichta, S., & Vandecar-Burdin, T. (2007). Domestic violence training policies: Influence on participation in training and awareness of abuse. *Affilia, 22*(3), 292–301.
doi:10.1177/0886109907302283
- Payne, B., & Triplett, R. (2009). Assessing the domestic violence training needs of benefits workers. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(4), 243–253.
doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9225-8
- Peek-Asa, C., Wallis, A., Harland, K., Beyer, K., Dickey, P., & Saftlas, A. (2011). Rural disparity in domestic violence prevalence and access to resources. *Journal of Women's Health, 20*(11), 1743–1749.
- Pence, E., & Eng, D. (2010). *The blueprint for safety: An interagency response to domestic violence crimes*. St. Paul, MN: Praxis International. Retrieved from http://www.praxisinternational.org/praxis_blue_print_for_safety.aspx
- Pennington-Zoellner, K. (2009). Expanding “community” in the community response to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(8), 539–545.
doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9252-5
- Peterson, R., & Dixon, J. (2005). Court oversight and conviction under mandatory and nonmandatory domestic violence case filing policies. *Criminology & Public Policy, 4*(3), 535–557.
- Postmus, J. L., Severson, M., Berry, M., & Yoo, J. A. (2009). Women's experiences of violence and seeking help. *Violence Against Women, 15*(7), 852–868.
doi:10.1177/1077801209334445
- Powers, L. E., Curry, M., Oswald, M., Maley, S., Eckels, K., & Saxton, M. (2002). Barriers and strategies in addressing abuse within personal assistance relationships: A survey of disabled women's experiences. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 68*(1), 4–13.
- Praxis International. (2010). *The Praxis safety and accountability audit*. St. Paul, MN. Retrieved from http://files.praxisinternational.org/General_Audit_Overview_Methodology.pdf
- Ptacek, J. (1999). *Battered women in the courtroom: The power of judicial responses*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Puffett, N. K., & Gavin, C. (2004). *Predictors of program outcome and recidivism at the Bronx misdemeanor domestic violence court*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.

- Radford, J., Harne, L., & Trotter, J. (2006). Disabled women and domestic violence as violent crime. *Practice: Social Work in Action, 18*(4), 233–246. doi:10.1080/09503150601025204
- Raj, A., & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence against immigrant women: The roles of culture, context, and legal immigrant status on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 8*(3), 367–398. doi:10.1177/10778010222183107
- Reckdenwald, A., & Parker, K. F. (2010). Understanding gender-specific intimate partner homicide: A theoretical and domestic service-oriented approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(5), 951–958. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.06.012
- Rennison, C., DeKeseredy, W. S., & Dragiewicz, M. (2012). Urban, suburban, and rural variations in separation/divorce rape/sexual assault: Results from the National Crime Victimization Survey. *Feminist Criminology*. doi:10.1177/1557085111435660
- Reyns, B. W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. S. (2012). Stalking in the twilight zone: Extent of cyberstalking victimization and offending among college students. *Deviant Behavior, 33*(1), 1–25.
- Rhodes, K. V., Cerulli, C., Kothari, C. L., Dichter, M. E., & Marcus, S. (2011). *Victim participation in intimate partner violence prosecution: Implications for safety* (NCJ 235284). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/235284.pdf>
- Roberts, K. A. (2005). Women's experience of violence during stalking by former romantic partners: Factors predictive of stalking violence. *Violence Against Women, 11*(1), 89–114. doi:10.1177/1077801204271096
- Rosay, A., Wood, D., Rivera, M., Postle, G., & TePas, K. (2011). *Investigation and prosecution of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking* (NCJ 236429). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236429.pdf>
- Runner, M., Yoshihama, M., & Novick, S. (2009). *Intimate partner violence in immigrant and refugee communities: Challenges, promising practices and recommendations*. Family Violence Prevention Fund. Retrieved from http://www.endabuse.org/userfiles/file/ImmigrantWomen/IPV_Report_March_2009.pdf
- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 157–162.
- Salazar, L. F., Emshoff, J. G., Baker, C. K., & Crowley, T. (2007). Examining the behavior of a system: An outcome evaluation of a coordinated community response to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(7), 631–641. doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9116-9

- Saylors, K., & Daliparthi, N. (2006). Violence against Native women In substance abuse treatment. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research, 13*(1), 32–51.
- Shepard, M. (1999). *Evaluating coordinated community responses to domestic violence*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_ccr.pdf
- Shepard, M., & Pence, E. (1999). An introduction: Developing a coordinated community response. In E. Pence & M. Shepard (Eds.), *Coordinating Community Responses to Domestic Violence: Lessons from Duluth and Beyond* (pp. 3–23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sheridan, L. P., & Grant, T. (2007). Is cyberstalking different? *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13*(6), 627–640. doi:10.1080/10683160701340528
- Smith, B., Davis, R., Nickles, L., & Davies, H. (2001). *An evaluation of efforts to implement no-drop policies: Two central values in conflict, final report* (NCJ 187772). Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Smith, D. L. (2008). Disability, gender and intimate partner violence: Relationships from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Sexuality and Disability, 26*(1), 15–28. doi:10.1007/s11195-007-9064-6
- Smith, E. L., Farole, D. J., Greipp, J., & Reichard, R. (2009). *Court processing of DV criminal cases in large urban counties*. Muskie School Webinar. Retrieved from <http://drop.io/UrbanIPV/login>
- Spohn, C., & Tellis, K. (2012). *Policing and prosecuting sexual assault in Los Angeles City and County: A collaborative study in partnership with the Los Angeles Police Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office* (NCJ 237582). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237582.pdf>
- Stover, C. S., Berkman, M., Desai, R., & Marans, S. (2010). The efficacy of a police-advocacy intervention for victims of domestic violence: 12 month follow-up data. *Violence Against Women, 16*(4), 410–425. doi:10.1177/1077801210364046
- Strack, G., & Gwinn, C. (2011). On the edge of homicide: Strangulation as a prelude. *Criminal Justice, 26*(3).
- Temple, J. R., Weston, R., Rodriguez, B. F., & Marshall, L. L. (2007). Differing effects of partner and nonpartner sexual assault on women's mental health. *Violence Against Women, 13*(3), 285–297.
- Thompson, R., Meyer, B. A., Smith-DiJulio, K., Caplow, M. P., Maiuro, R. D., Thompson, D. C., ... Rivara, F. P. (1998). A training program to improve domestic violence identification and management in primary care: Preliminary results. *Violence and Victims, 13*(4), 395–410.

- Thompson, R., Rivara, F., Thompson, D., Barlow, W., Sugg, N., Maiuro, R., & Rubanowice, D. (2000). Identification and management of domestic violence: A randomized trial. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 19(4), 253–263. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00231-2
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2006). *Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJ 210346). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/210346.pdf>
- Tolman, R., & Raphael, J. (2000). A review of research on welfare and domestic violence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(4), 655–682. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00190
- Townsend, M., Hunt, D., Kuck, S., & Baxter, C. (2005). *Law enforcement response to domestic violence calls for service* (NCJ 215915). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/215915.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2011). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2012 (131st Edition)*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging. (2007). *Unofficial compilation of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended in 2006 (Public Law 109-365)*. Retrieved from http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aoa_programs/oa/oa_full.asp
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. (2012). *Areas of focus: Sexual assault*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/areas-focus.html#sa>
- Ullman, S. E., Najdowski, C. J., & Filipas, H. H. (2009). Child sexual abuse, post-traumatic stress disorder, and substance use: Predictors of revictimization in adult sexual assault survivors. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 18(4), 367–385.
- Vidales, G. T. (2010). Arrested justice: The multifaceted plight of immigrant Latinas who faced domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(6), 533–544. doi:10.1007/s10896-010-9309-5
- Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2011). Immigrant and refugee victims of domestic violence homicide in Washington State. *Washington State Domestic Violence Fatality Review*.
- White, J., McMullin, D., Swartout, S., & Gollehon, A. (2008). Violence in intimate relationships: A conceptual and empirical examination of sexual and physical aggression. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3), 338–351.
- Wood, D. S., & Magen, R. H. (2009). Intimate partner violence against Athabaskan women residing in interior Alaska. *Violence Against Women*, 15(4), 497–507. doi:10.1177/1077801208331245

- Wooldredge, J., & Thistlethwaite, A. (2005). Court dispositions and rearrest for intimate assault. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51(1), 75–102.
doi:10.1177/0011128704266422
- Yoshihama, M., Bybee, D., Dabby, C., & Blazeviski, J. (2010). *Lifecourse experiences of intimate partner violence and help-seeking women among Filipina, Indian, and Pakistani women: Implications for justice system responses* (NCJ 236174). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Yuan, N. P., Koss, M., Polacca, M., & Goldman, D. (2006). Risk factors for physical assault and rape among six Native American tribes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(12), 1566–1590. doi:10.1177/0886260506294239
- Zweig, J. M., & Burt, M. R. (2003). Effects of interactions among community agencies on legal system responses to domestic violence and sexual assault in STOP-funded communities. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 14(2), 249–272.
doi:10.1177/0887403403014002006

Appendix A 2009

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
Alabama	34	18	8	6	1	1	605,500	445,647	375,000	98,337	67,337	1,591,821	196,774
Alaska	8	3	2	2	1	0	222,836	79,920	206,650	16,308	0	525,714	41,058
American Samoa	15	8	3	2	2	0	455,146	308,621	308,621	38,648	0	1,111,036	61,911
Arizona	18	8	5	3	2	0	834,383	379,346	356,105	170,100	0	1,739,934	0
Arkansas	72	9	28	30	1	4	330,148	350,217	485,003	6,452	81,681	1,253,501	89,032
California	142	65	61	15	1	0	3,452,555	3,134,566	2,902,060	509,204	0	9,998,385	1,131,565
Colorado	58	33	12	10	1	2	481,648	317,390	330,628	63,477	74,872	1,268,015	188,078
Connecticut	9	5	2	1	1	0	424,553	102,206	343,500	68,843	0	939,102	100,004
Delaware	13	7	3	1	2	0	354,609	85,732	197,005	38,735	0	676,081	0
District of Columbia	12	3	4	2	1	2	208,946	295,322	174,122	34,025	91,248	803,663	61,461
Florida	125	29	39	53	4	0	1,891,547	1,232,092	1,177,696	291,079	0	4,592,414	0
Georgia	49	31	7	10	1	0	1,602,093	369,202	511,999	54,243	0	2,537,537	344,686
Guam	41	18	7	5	6	5	349,634	289,577	289,577	57,916	174,245	1,160,949	129,812
Hawaii	16	7	3	3	1	2	418,779	80,083	164,980	41,610	113,867	819,319	96,488
Idaho	16	5	3	4	1	3	281,617	234,681	234,681	46,936	140,809	938,724	14,303
Illinois	33	0	9	6	3	15	0	1,365,339	944,802	146,774	574,495	3,031,410	0
Indiana	90	50	12	26	2	0	1,185,205	559,897	732,619	111,772	0	2,589,493	0
Iowa	76	26	34	12	2	2	546,695	378,747	362,945	94,399	95,771	1,478,557	71,226
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	64,510
Kentucky	35	10	7	9	5	4	499,232	351,636	395,144	97,605	258,082	1,601,699	234,554
Louisiana	82	42	21	14	3	2	622,216	372,645	355,605	121,050	75,602	1,547,118	0
Maine	31	10	12	6	1	2	336,517	321,641	256,266	45,000	43,137	1,002,561	0
Maryland	123	50	27	19	5	22	742,624	576,429	656,023	100,990	290,685	2,366,751	241,322
Massachusetts	73	33	28	10	2	0	1,089,200	722,248	600,028	115,399	0	2,526,875	167,585
Michigan	370	92	94	94	90	0	1,520,883	844,934	844,934	168,986	0	3,379,737	169,880

⁵⁹ Data in Table A1a are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2009.

Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009⁵⁹

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
Minnesota	12	12	0	0	-	0	859,270	0	0	-	0	859,270	0
Mississippi	45	23	10	11	1	0	586,392	309,155	461,948	64,350	0	1,421,845	0
Missouri	63	39	12	8	3	1	946,541	486,314	486,324	141,670	40,716	2,101,565	115,113
Montana	22	7	5	5	1	4	255,040	203,789	194,953	37,500	126,426	817,708	139,598
Nebraska	44	14	13	10	2	5	300,160	246,460	246,460	49,292	147,876	990,248	106,827
Nevada	47	21	9	10	4	3	456,090	340,599	287,057	80,369	85,000	1,249,115	154,466
New Hampshire	34	9	10	13	2	0	304,872	278,678	251,250	120,000	0	954,800	53,269
New Jersey	45	22	10	12	0	1	897,553	548,353	650,806	0	80,000	2,176,712	117,509
New Mexico	39	11	13	7	2	6	309,990	543,012	388,886	48,322	161,278	1,451,488	125,529
New York	131	57	37	32	1	4	456,090	1,452,130	1,521,949	284,260	248,818	5,716,027	0
N. Mariana Islands	10	3	3	2	2	0	243,346	140,747	140,747	38,149	0	562,989	60,558
North Carolina	75	24	22	12	4	13	2,239,510	2,051,081	1,920,010	257,222	1,376,701	7,844,524	454,390
North Dakota	164	52	35	33	11	33	445,217	432,920	439,861	78,566	223,831	1,620,395	94,589
Ohio	246	85	49	55	18	39	2,370,655	1,844,650	1,842,972	365,984	1,145,737	7,569,998	0
Oklahoma	45	19	11	6	4	5	477,348	420,956	301,022	69,437	205,228	1,473,991	218,702
Oregon	56	39	7	8	2	0	704,507	377,000	367,649	76,613	0	1,525,769	153,516
Pennsylvania	282	94	94	94	-	0	800,334	409,253	412,927	-	0	1,622,514	0
Puerto Rico	43	32	3	3	2	3	475,091	207,566	225,391	60,207	18,668	986,923	202,319
Rhode Island	27	4	21	1	1	0	368,077	400,492	204,312	39,605	0	1,012,486	113,975
South Carolina	24	13	6	2	2	1	546,101	85,842	345,636	62,921	114,435	1,154,935	0
South Dakota	35	25	2	6	1	1	235,664	218,679	205,844	57,026	80,342	797,555	25,395
Tennessee	58	32	14	9	3	0	962,949	554,590	526,440	94,230	0	2,138,209	0
Texas	87	37	21	25	3	1	2,960,368	1,930,547	1,928,764	388,911	288,574	7,497,164	610,039
Vermont	31	12	12	6	1	0	293,133	202,575	252,772	39,126	0	787,606	39,126
Virgin Islands	19	10	2	2	1	4	543,275	294,650	294,650	29,748	80,000	1,242,323	0
Virginia	88	36	19	15	5	13	770,607	595,462	554,156	117,754	303,248	2,341,227	264,794
Washington	137	52	40	42	1	2	884,995	678,793	689,193	103,306	25,000	2,381,287	291,361

Table A1a: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2009⁵⁹

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
West Virginia	53	17	17	13	2	4	372,309	261,501	244,920	73,427	71,420	1,023,577	75,720
Wisconsin	32	19	8	5	-	0	738,666	531,263	514,848	59,240	0	1,844,017	200,744
Wyoming	47	23	0	1	23	0	13,583	0	45,479	21,117	0	80,179	0
TOTAL	3,628	1,421	943	809	244	211	42,395,776	29,485,969	29,748,897	5,440,858	6,992,597	114,064,097	7,099,498

Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2009

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Alabama	20	80	0	100
Alaska	29	64	7	100
American Samoa	50	50	0	100
Arizona	15	83	2	100
Arkansas	13	86	1	100
California	22	77	1	100
Colorado	28	70	2	100
Connecticut	50	50	0	100
Delaware	25	70	5	100
District of Columbia	37	62	1	100
Florida	18	80	2	100
Georgia	37	59	4	100
Guam	37	37	26	100
Hawaii	43	57	0	100
Idaho	15	80	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	23	74	3	100
Iowa	24	72	4	100
Kansas	17	77	6	100
Kentucky	37	27	36	100
Louisiana	20	77	3	100
Maine	34	65	1	100
Maryland	30	68	2	100
Massachusetts	20	78	2	100
Michigan	20	74	6	100
Minnesota	45	50	5	100
Mississippi	50	50	0	100
Missouri	18	80	2	100
Montana	19	70	11	100
Nebraska	16	82	2	100
Nevada	11	81	8	100
New Hampshire	30	60	10	100
New Jersey	40	60	0	100
New Mexico	35	50	15	100
New York	29	69	2	100
N. Mariana Islands	5	93	2	100
North Carolina	32	59	9	100
North Dakota	27	73	0	100
Ohio	14	79	7	100
Oklahoma	22	73	5	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100

Table A2a. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2009

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Pennsylvania	35	60	5	100
Puerto Rico	2	97	1	100
Rhode Island	29	68	3	100
South Carolina	40	50	10	100
South Dakota	15	77	8	100
Tennessee	9	88	3	100
Texas	20	78	2	100
Utah	14	81	5	100
Vermont	20	70	10	100
Virgin Islands	13	83	4	100
Virginia	19	78	3	100
Washington	15	80	5	100
West Virginia	19	69	12	100
Wisconsin	56	38	6	100
Wyoming	6	81	13	100

Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

State	2009 ⁶⁰			2010 ⁶¹		
	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Alabama	605,500	150,000	24.8	771,353	163,500	21.2
Alaska	222,836	30,000	13.5	297,040	57,830	19.5
American Samoa	455,146	455,146	100	217,582	217,582	100
Arizona	834,383	64,320	7.7	833,939	64,320	7.7
Arkansas	330,148	60,636	18.4	337,313	78,570	23.3
California	3,452,555	1,049,663	30.4	4,301,657	1,150,212	26.7
Colorado	481,648	74,989	15.6	677,784	174,394	25.7
Connecticut	424,553	0	0	662,780	0	0
Delaware	354,609	46,931	13.2	366,138	48,571	13.3
District of Columbia	208,946	65,250	31.2	215,233	215,233	100
Florida	1,891,547	161,920	8.6	2,555,483	161,482	6.3
Georgia	1,602,093	257,573	16.1	1,391,536	470,247	33.8
Guam	349,634	349,634	100	353,057	105,219	29.8
Hawaii	418,779	153,019	36.5	372,196	76,085	20.4
Idaho	281,617	43,787	15.5	281,617	89,788	31.9
Illinois	0	0	0	1,185,970	0	0
Indiana	1,185,205	138,044	11.6	1,361,091	222,115	16.3
Iowa	546,695	46,530	8.5	629,715	61,469	9.8
Kansas	388,961	0	0	978,370	91,242	9.3
Kentucky	499,232	289,236	57.9	494,021	57,450	11.6
Louisiana	622,216	92,247	14.8	531,001	98,000	18.5
Maine	336,517	65,729	19.5	309,787	89,022	28.7
Maryland	742,624	81,748	11.0	616,856	267,657	43.4
Massachusetts	1,089,200	135,500	12.4	1,153,648	142,455	12.3
Michigan	1,520,883	191,167	12.6	1,417,624	115,417	8.1
Minnesota	859,270	141,106	16.4	625,600	431,079	68.9
Mississippi	586,392	119,756	20.4	1,148,183	153,169	13.3
Missouri	946,541	117,121	12.4	906,566	109,122	12.0
Montana	255,040	31,540	12.4	318,540	31,540	9.9
Nebraska	300,160	33,983	11.3	308,611	48,847	15.8

⁶⁰The Illinois STOP administrator reported that no victim services awards were made in 2009. The STOP administrators in Connecticut, Wyoming, and Kansas did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

⁶¹It appears that the Virgin Islands did not make victim services awards in 2010; the STOP administrators in Connecticut, Illinois, and Nevada did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

Table A3a. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

State	2009 ⁶⁰			2010 ⁶¹		
	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs	Total amounts awarded to victim services	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Nevada	456,090	23,600	5.2	0	0	0
New Hampshire	304,872	30,000	9.8	291,500	40,000	13.7
New Jersey	897,553	133,480	14.9	1,547,709	179,500	11.6
New Mexico	309,990	101,874	32.9	438,995	71,198	16.2
New York	2,208,870	351,616	15.9	2,428,484	436,885	18.0
N. Mariana Islands	243,346	16,890	6.9	181,171	14,583	8.0
North Carolina	2,239,510	312,121	13.9	183,645	178,741	97.3
North Dakota	445,217	41,636	9.4	460,814	47,997	10.4
Ohio	2,370,655	817,794	34.5	2,548,668	778,153	30.5
Oklahoma	477,348	97,937	20.5	433,981	56,028	12.9
Oregon	704,507	49,418	7.0	747,158	57,207	7.7
Pennsylvania	800,334	377,545	47.2	2,929,165	708,581	24.2
Puerto Rico	475,091	160,151	33.7	741,021	347,767	46.9
Rhode Island	368,077	23,833	6.5	382,097	24,517	6.4
South Carolina	546,101	83,055	15.2	1,382,698	205,000	14.8
South Dakota	235,664	39,693	16.8	216,025	30,885	14.3
Tennessee	962,949	89,317	9.3	879,623	89,317	10.2
Texas	2,960,368	1,241,330	41.9	2,707,887	1,310,441	48.4
Utah	368,697	98,722	26.8	311,767	459,054	147.2
Vermont	293,133	45,000	15.4	283,295	30,000	10.6
Virgin Islands	543,275	543,275	100	0	0	0
Virginia	770,607	74,908	9.7	821,621	81,958	10.0
Washington	884,995	130,088	14.7	905,284	113,980	12.6
West Virginia	372,309	37,250	10.0	355,983	77,609	21.8
Wisconsin	738,666	243,088	32.9	979,459	289,889	29.6
Wyoming	13,583	0	0	196,297	13,250	6.7
TOTAL	42,784,737	9,610,196	22.5	47,974,638	10,634,157	22.2

Appendix B 2009

Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Alabama	26	10	5	2	3	6	4	18	7	8	0	0	0
Alaska	19	15	6	9	1	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	6	8	4	1	7	1	8	4	2	1	0	0	0
Arizona	18	11	4	3	3	4	3	13	1	3	1	2	0
Arkansas	24	4	2	4	3	15	2	13	9	4	0	0	0
California	159	56	19	15	4	36	4	139	9	20	0	7	0
Colorado	61	32	9	9	2	6	2	50	0	6	0	0	0
Connecticut	9	4	4	3	1	3	2	6	1	1	0	0	1
Delaware	12	2	1	3	2	3	0	9	0	1	1	1	0
District of Columbia	10	5	1	2	1	2	2	8	0	1	0	0	0
Florida	43	9	6	8	1	21	2	26	12	12	1	0	0
Georgia	41	27	19	15	5	10	11	30	3	4	0	0	0
Guam	11	5	1	8	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	17	10	2	4	2	9	4	9	3	4	0	0	0
Idaho	15	8	1	3	1	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	11	10	4	4	3	5	3	19	5	5	0	4	0
Indiana	71	41	18	19	9	15	9	51	5	20	0	0	0
Iowa	65	30	19	6	8	31	5	28	22	10	0	0	0
Kansas	19	11	6	5	3	6	2	13	1	5	1	0	0
Kentucky	30	9	7	4	0	9	2	20	7	3	1	0	0
Louisiana	77	18	7	7	11	25	2	46	22	11	1	0	0
Maine	17	9	7	4	4	5	1	10	5	2	0	0	1
Maryland	60	20	11	6	6	15	10	38	4	5	0	0	1
Massachusetts	55	25	8	19	5	6	5	46	3	3	0	0	0
Michigan	50	27	14	9	8	8	6	47	2	5	0	0	0
Minnesota	27	16	14	10	4	2	7	10	0	0	0	1	0
Mississippi	36	2	2	1	0	0	0	18	11	6	0	0	0
Missouri	63	22	9	12	2	17	3	43	12	7	2	0	3
Montana	20	12	0	0	2	0	0	13	3	1	0	0	0
Nebraska	13	12	8	2	2	5	3	8	3	5	0	0	3

Table B1a. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2009

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Nevada	30	12	9	10	1	5	5	27	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	21	12	7	9	3	7	2	12	3	5	0	0	0
New Jersey	48	32	15	25	8	0	11	40	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	40	17	9	10	9	7	7	17	2	4	0	0	0
New York	110	68	40	40	20	26	9	90	10	17	0	2	1
North Carolina	41	18	16	9	10	22	7	16	9	4	3	0	0
North Dakota	38	12	9	0	5	3	4	33	2	0	0	0	2
N. Mariana Islands	4	4	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	0
Ohio	91	31	13	10	6	28	8	69	18	11	0	0	0
Oklahoma	34	18	6	10	5	13	6	17	7	5	0	3	0
Oregon	55	21	6	9	1	3	8	49	0	2	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	51	38	21	15	8	29	8	47	26	34	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	11	2	1	0	1	1	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
Rhode Island	11	7	3	3	2	1	2	8	0	1	0	0	0
South Carolina	15	6	2	3	2	2	2	14	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	34	9	5	5	3	2	6	30	0	6	0	0	1
Tennessee	45	20	11	10	6	8	1	31	3	6	1	0	0
Texas	123	42	19	9	11	34	9	92	13	16	1	0	0
Utah	37	21	11	9	4	6	3	29	3	2	1	0	0
Vermont	11	8	4	2	2	6	3	10	5	5	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	6	2	1	1	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	2
Virginia	87	53	18	63	15	25	8	57	12	10	0	1	0
Washington	81	35	7	1	12	6	5	61	9	8	0	0	0
West Virginia	20	9	9	4	1	4	0	11	12	9	0	0	1
Wisconsin	35	24	13	8	2	8	12	13	3	4	0	0	0
Wyoming	30	9	3	5	1	2	4	30	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	2194	1000	477	467	245	516	242	1588	291	305	15	21	16

Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees using funds for victim services	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
			Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	26	18	7754	7414	300	40	7714	7026	529	159
Alaska	20	14	2584	2360	22	202	2382	1942	384	56
American Samoa	8	4	1630	1630	0	0	1630	1473	157	0
Arizona	18	13	5014	5006	4	4	5010	4594	317	99
Arkansas	24	13	5291	5148	102	41	5250	3966	964	320
California	166	139	21396	19730	755	911	20485	14907	5437	141
Colorado	62	50	15524	15236	236	52	15472	13112	2189	171
Connecticut	10	6	5191	5191	0	0	5191	4727	464	0
Delaware	13	9	2829	2710	74	45	2784	2693	80	11
District of Columbia	11	8	775	648	19	108	667	480	187	0
Florida	43	26	19127	18139	785	203	18924	17473	1070	381
Georgia	42	30	13940	12767	515	658	13282	7763	5363	156
Guam	14	6	825	816	4	5	820	633	165	22
Hawaii	23	9	1738	1735	2	1	1737	1521	215	1
Idaho	16	14	3160	3044	77	39	3121	2857	180	84
Illinois	23	19	20946	20606	322	18	20928	19039	1887	2
Indiana	75	51	13485	13015	429	41	13444	12228	854	362
Iowa	71	28	7478	7394	36	48	7430	6631	754	45
Kansas	20	13	6567	6479	88	0	6567	5837	248	482
Kentucky	30	20	8681	8107	494	80	8601	8167	383	51
Louisiana	85	46	21567	21424	25	118	21449	19259	1973	217
Maine	22	10	2618	2004	487	127	2491	2037	418	36
Maryland	62	38	10084	9641	397	46	10038	9228	756	54
Massachusetts	55	46	10529	9988	267	274	10255	9700	487	68
Michigan	50	47	15494	15270	144	80	15414	13016	1586	812
Minnesota	28	10	1886	1857	29	0	1886	1177	709	0
Mississippi	36	18	5656	5365	237	54	5602	4979	580	43
Missouri	64	43	13312	12264	763	285	13027	10866	1324	837
Montana	23	13	2749	2749	0	0	2749	2181	287	281
Nebraska	13	8	3812	3653	159	0	3812	3471	298	43
Nevada	31	27	9047	8849	103	95	8952	7533	698	721
New Hampshire	21	12	2401	2215	89	97	2304	1616	583	105
New Jersey	50	40	12275	12131	54	90	12185	11051	1133	1

Table B2a. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims seeking/receiving services, by state: 2009

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
		using funds for victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Mexico	43	17	1399	1371	16	12	1387	1150	211	26
New York	110	90	28740	26327	1990	423	28317	24731	3445	141
North Carolina	47	16	6037	5846	174	17	6020	5594	156	270
North Dakota	40	33	1788	1760	20	8	1780	1523	238	19
N. Mariana Islands	5	3	311	311	0	0	311	261	29	21
Ohio	91	69	28587	27531	911	145	28442	25037	2510	895
Oklahoma	36	17	3467	3340	101	26	3441	2906	441	94
Oregon	56	49	9419	8958	372	89	9330	7451	1611	268
Pennsylvania	51	47	22983	22733	184	66	22917	17582	4995	340
Puerto Rico	11	9	4285	4219	63	3	4282	4258	3	21
Rhode Island	11	8	6248	6148	100	0	6248	5780	443	25
South Carolina	20	14	342	328	7	7	335	180	134	21
South Dakota	34	30	6426	6296	89	41	6385	4753	464	1168
Tennessee	45	31	4746	4653	31	62	4684	4135	399	150
Texas	125	92	41030	37277	2575	1178	39852	36377	3025	450
Utah	38	29	8257	7828	399	30	8227	7160	611	456
Vermont	12	10	1621	1611	10	0	1621	1233	334	54
Virgin Islands	7	4	320	318	2	0	320	311	8	1
Virginia	87	57	14746	14288	374	84	14662	11941	2483	238
Washington	90	61	5785	5734	35	16	5769	5290	421	58
West Virginia	22	11	4017	3967	42	8	4009	3712	256	41
Wisconsin	39	13	5455	4986	205	264	5191	2022	3114	55
Wyoming	30	30	1133	1130	2	1	1132	974	57	101
TOTAL	2305	1588	482507	461545	14720	6242	476265	407544	58047	10674

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Race/ethnicity								Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown	
Alabama	2943	12	18	6	222	4178	407	6708	709	297	193	1424	3989	230	1878	
Alaska	78	903	67	66	172	1068	193	2226	122	34	143	461	1628	61	89	
American Samoa	0	0	1	1629	0	0	0	1414	216	0	169	640	695	126	0	
Arizona	221	97	43	8	2016	2167	518	4107	783	120	225	914	3228	221	422	
Arkansas	1751	6	41	1	132	3291	28	4318	927	5	657	1009	2857	646	81	
California	2279	927	627	134	5733	6706	4513	18427	1538	520	1540	4463	9843	675	3964	
Colorado	631	202	103	38	3830	7008	5440	13993	1071	408	671	2752	7901	257	3891	
Connecticut	1764	5	69	5	1776	1499	73	4160	1029	2	324	1206	3534	125	2	
Delaware	654	5	23	1	325	1735	42	2527	257	0	63	558	2086	73	4	
District of Columbia	295	0	119	0	138	56	59	587	22	58	9	159	392	19	88	
Florida	4134	29	114	47	3427	9139	2060	15983	2519	422	520	3724	12437	714	1529	
Georgia	4372	12	203	18	1091	3434	4204	9366	823	3093	714	2153	5700	390	4325	
Guam	8	1	40	718	2	32	22	681	130	9	160	179	443	10	28	
Hawaii	3	3	82	164	9	161	1357	1733	4	0	54	129	259	18	1277	
Idaho	24	77	24	3	589	2354	63	2936	184	1	160	798	1997	150	16	
Illinois	8620	102	300	49	3622	8773	533	19683	1060	185	980	4487	14261	374	826	
Indiana	2859	18	72	3	1435	7347	1727	11533	885	1026	391	3469	6928	410	2246	
Iowa	858	65	66	17	1538	4785	135	6914	480	36	387	1606	4586	307	544	
Kansas	1422	57	70	10	1043	3750	215	5738	792	37	182	1579	3702	834	270	
Kentucky	712	30	71	15	888	6651	234	7634	966	1	279	2270	5545	173	334	
Louisiana	7857	54	97	7	281	9847	3309	16337	2041	3071	1109	4735	10848	535	4222	
Maine	118	11	8	3	60	2273	218	2307	175	9	121	720	1551	67	32	
Maryland	4657	20	129	4	1372	3457	399	8605	1045	388	311	2350	6501	342	534	
Massachusetts	1518	14	191	5	2172	5554	840	9188	870	197	473	2177	6831	406	368	
Michigan	5054	151	52	11	1119	8491	547	14623	721	70	499	4140	9839	370	566	

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Minnesota	119	688	21	0	443	502	113	1792	81	13	330	526	796	17	217
Mississippi	2192	47	38	1	110	2396	818	4863	97	642	387	1284	2931	126	874
Missouri	3868	174	66	17	559	7819	543	11805	1197	25	454	2845	8186	262	1280
Montana	24	402	12	8	108	2104	91	2474	273	2	208	1218	1194	128	1
Nebraska	308	82	28	1	480	2639	274	3553	253	6	168	1032	2332	51	229
Nevada	475	317	172	40	3333	4322	293	7586	1157	209	364	2175	5591	397	425
New Hampshire	97	4	16	1	113	1809	267	1871	400	33	190	499	1393	64	158
New Jersey	2568	5	585	20	2249	6182	576	10782	1215	188	271	2403	8361	367	783
New Mexico	15	29	37	1	883	355	67	1241	146	0	97	380	785	41	84
New York	7109	275	1203	54	3852	13964	1975	25466	2663	188	1750	6090	18019	682	1776
North Carolina	1945	12	79	21	397	3169	409	5013	963	44	212	1342	3778	194	494
North Dakota	74	448	8	0	86	1054	110	1640	140	0	77	502	1144	37	20
N. Mariana Islands	1	0	66	232	0	7	5	278	33	0	23	42	237	9	0
Ohio	6857	54	86	8	1080	16932	3478	26537	1766	139	1375	6892	15570	1973	2632
Oklahoma	350	473	20	7	366	2172	54	3302	136	3	134	822	2356	88	41
Oregon	152	351	79	33	1502	6090	1127	8440	739	151	235	1631	6444	435	585
Pennsylvania	3320	66	294	64	2177	15187	1881	21073	1461	383	1139	5257	13988	1092	1441
Puerto Rico	0	8	1	0	4203	59	11	4175	107	0	82	1055	2951	118	76
Rhode Island	602	322	78	1	717	4183	345	5112	1058	78	496	2577	2880	233	62
South Carolina	114	0	0	0	22	187	12	315	19	1	68	36	208	5	18
South Dakota	204	2362	35	27	119	3439	359	5473	874	38	444	1392	4000	212	337
Tennessee	1007	10	26	13	310	3233	85	4220	456	8	104	966	3315	260	39
Texas	8781	159	542	33	14308	11965	4078	33176	3641	3035	1404	8977	24776	716	3979
Utah	197	250	133	73	1999	5202	436	7740	464	23	178	1893	5441	409	306
Vermont	42	17	6	4	23	1042	502	1507	91	23	107	270	845	65	334
Virgin Islands	209	0	6	1	77	24	3	235	85	0	12	65	152	80	11

Table B3a. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13–17	18–24	25–29	60+	Unknown
Virginia	3863	47	296	40	1304	8399	731	13219	1287	156	875	3107	9358	489	833
Washington	298	212	253	67	1345	3540	54	5556	196	17	49	1426	3994	284	16
West Virginia	348	4	11	4	25	3479	141	3613	358	38	216	854	2507	118	314
Wisconsin	839	139	186	0	1345	2533	149	4653	484	54	551	1089	3273	155	123
Wyoming	37	30	13	10	149	871	26	998	128	6	53	221	780	73	5
TOTAL	98847	9788	7026	3743	76676	238615	46149	419436	41337	15492	22387	106970	285166	16713	45029

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/ asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	206	91	12	2126
Alaska	160	146	156	1782
American Samoa	5	89	56	155
Arizona	175	532	496	1172
Arkansas	45	36	9	379
California	1372	1684	789	2540
Colorado	1119	1585	756	4157
Connecticut	226	395	26	143
Delaware	74	93	172	1050
District of Columbia	36	210	224	0
Florida	455	2060	1481	3275
Georgia	304	710	725	1354
Guam	17	13	2	609
Hawaii	47	30	21	209
Idaho	338	333	283	1925
Illinois	637	2688	57	1983
Indiana	657	1154	905	2332
Iowa	348	871	907	4957
Kansas	165	351	187	1574
Kentucky	945	393	493	4468
Louisiana	1150	163	30	9273
Maine	199	89	99	1620
Maryland	272	1438	474	2685
Massachusetts	480	1733	997	1125
Michigan	990	596	243	3833
Minnesota	144	160	172	1597
Mississippi	213	69	9	1298
Missouri	741	385	231	4667
Montana	345	0	10	0
Nebraska	264	650	165	1343
Nevada	370	2344	696	1575
New Hampshire	142	39	43	269
New Jersey	530	1148	510	480
New Mexico	112	314	352	812
New York	1596	2768	2354	5351
North Carolina	326	329	72	856
North Dakota	148	40	38	560

Table B4a. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2009

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/ asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
N. Mariana Islands	0	54	23	40
Ohio	1355	808	363	6842
Oklahoma	212	187	117	1817
Oregon	594	1147	738	5179
Pennsylvania	1999	931	436	6316
Puerto Rico	472	103	270	1015
Rhode Island	18	250	7	30
South Carolina	13	7	0	148
South Dakota	131	48	32	2429
Tennessee	482	248	252	2569
Texas	1952	5644	1905	7768
Utah	376	1463	834	2284
Vermont	249	28	27	1126
Virgin Islands	1	28	11	24
Virginia	781	890	677	4281
Washington	290	330	79	2649
West Virginia	248	25	5	1002
Wisconsin	278	1210	933	516
Wyoming	115	28	20	302
TOTAL	24919	39158	20981	119871

Table B5a. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2009

State	<i>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
Alabama	3969	930	1220	139	56	1406
Alaska	1608	313	72	208	41	308
American Samoa	1038	97	87	37	65	312
Arizona	3447	885	345	176	65	131
Arkansas	2905	1336	774	154	29	53
California	9440	1672	2303	2188	766	4930
Colorado	10565	703	1563	734	359	1757
Connecticut	3140	1138	663	146	33	71
Delaware	2395	146	179	37	6	29
District of Columbia	489	39	46	25	10	58
Florida	13856	1721	1451	373	130	1501
Georgia	6653	759	1014	890	381	3660
Guam	341	191	185	49	13	41
Hawaii	171	68	17	65	67	1383
Idaho	2482	489	711	153	79	8
Illinois	11342	2234	6801	984	534	552
Indiana	8520	883	1970	523	168	1589
Iowa	5277	505	1199	261	57	201
Kansas	3826	466	1426	222	35	596
Kentucky	5040	1047	1815	275	112	360
Louisiana	9488	1859	3020	529	146	6597
Maine	1996	97	197	133	15	119
Maryland	6933	462	1086	256	101	1232
Massachusetts	5901	1312	2453	159	83	516
Michigan	8516	822	5216	729	264	472
Minnesota	816	346	194	224	228	78
Mississippi	4263	389	624	234	30	62
Missouri	8272	1220	1820	918	258	900
Montana	2135	385	13	215	85	42
Nebraska	1953	93	996	236	40	576
Nevada	5921	762	1479	202	95	740
New Hampshire	1123	356	411	231	20	198
New Jersey	7531	902	2588	260	137	930
New Mexico	977	151	58	115	61	37
New York	17610	3993	3751	1261	621	1353
North Carolina	2223	452	1842	216	145	1169

Table B5a. Victim's relationship to offender for victims served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2009

State	<i>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
North Dakota	1321	84	158	148	42	33
N. Mariana Islands	181	91	20	26	0	1
Ohio	18445	3351	4173	1526	291	1328
Oklahoma	2344	533	1073	566	262	146
Oregon	6184	763	597	576	98	1112
Pennsylvania	14787	3529	1429	1586	620	1432
Puerto Rico	3954	3	257	26	8	35
Rhode Island	1537	477	462	235	39	3548
South Carolina	167	88	27	32	12	27
South Dakota	3275	319	273	161	42	3038
Tennessee	3180	470	653	203	65	145
Texas	25620	7425	4256	995	172	3606
Utah	6152	714	817	386	82	100
Vermont	1120	162	187	101	21	148
Virgin Islands	241	74	2	3	0	0
Virginia	10459	1690	1247	1105	174	490
Washington	3811	691	1053	162	53	20
West Virginia	2867	503	644	96	37	40
Wisconsin	1970	1529	386	965	496	660
Wyoming	708	37	186	72	28	119
TOTAL	290485	51756	67489	22527	7877	49995

Appendix A 2010

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010⁶²

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
Alabama	37	17	10	8	1	1	771,353	579,130	650,350	98,387	30,000	2,129,220	559,059
Alaska	14	8	2	2	2	0	297,040	201,654	94,085	9,379	0	602,158	38,518
American Samoa	9	5	2	1	1	0	217,582	155,416	155,416	31,083	0	559,497	62,166
Arizona	35	16	10	6	3	0	833,939	628,906	451,918	185,440	0	2,100,203	126,438
Arkansas	25	4	10	10	0	1	337,313	394,351	445,831	0	47,470	1,224,965	81,102
California	114	62	29	21	2	0	4,301,657	3,690,846	3,293,183	527,178	0	11,812,864	1,265,424
Colorado	41	15	11	9	3	3	677,784	418,232	446,385	105,907	60,336	1,708,644	0
Connecticut	24	9	11	1	3	0	662,780	775,122	366,500	181,588	0	1,985,990	70,666
Delaware	14	7	5	1	1	0	366,138	185,030	203,412	39,401	0	793,981	42,823
District of Columbia	9	1	2	2	1	3	215,233	259,640	179,361	35,872	106,805	796,911	17,236
Florida	78	16	25	35	2	0	2,555,483	1,533,185	1,604,538	317,289	0	6,010,495	704,149
Georgia	72	34	17	18	3	0	1,391,536	919,930	967,424	144,740	0	3,423,630	649,744
Guam	23	15	2	2	2	2	353,057	292,430	292,430	58,486	175,958	1,172,361	131,080
Hawaii	20	6	6	6	2	0	372,196	151,082	287,765	51,528	0	862,571	89,390
Idaho	16	5	3	4	1	3	281,617	234,681	234,681	46,936	140,809	938,724	104,303
Illinois	38	2	11	6	4	15	1,185,970	1,499,976	937,284	199,144	581,268	4,403,642	621,385
Indiana	79	48	6	23	2	0	1,361,091	411,516	642,201	111,647	0	2,526,455	135,674
Iowa	71	29	24	12	5	1	629,715	433,852	388,459	83,661	58,553	1,594,240	77,645
Kansas	57	19	17	12	7	2	978,370	913,755	846,746	279,522	55,878	3,074,271	64,986
Kentucky	33	11	7	10	2	3	494,021	373,558	474,844	66,512	264,741	1,673,676	113,352
Louisiana	85	34	25	22	1	3	531,001	520,288	592,845	39,076	80,662	1,763,872	189,292
Maine	33	10	8	7	0	8	309,787	237,773	215,601	0	200,857	964,018	153,379
Maryland	123	45	37	18	2	21	616,856	575,117	464,343	107,452	293,732	2,057,500	101,756
Massachusetts	68	31	24	10	3	0	1,153,648	647,423	699,850	126,940	0	2,627,861	173,354
Michigan	370	92	94	94	90	0	1,417,624	974,784	976,956	186,344	0	3,555,708	145,673

⁶² Data in Table A1 are based on annual reports submitted by STOP administrators and reflect awards to subgrantees during calendar year 2010.

Table A1b: Number of STOP Program awards to subgrantees and amounts allocated, by category, by state: 2010⁶²

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						Total	ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC			
Minnesota	32	8	11	11	-	2	625,600	190,000	190,000	-	312,800	1,318,400	252,306	
Mississippi	86	42	20	19	5	0	1,148,183	599,969	781,919	243,312	0	2,773,383	41,382	
Missouri	59	37	10	8	3	1	906,566	409,521	524,178	141,057	39,494	2,020,816	93,628	
Montana	23	8	5	6	2	2	318,540	202,800	225,430	41,560	22,812	811,142	90,127	
Nebraska	52	14	13	13	2	10	308,611	257,175	257,175	51,436	154,305	1,028,702	112,079	
Nevada	7	-	2	4	-	1	-	9,950	28,179	-	12,000	50,129	190,579	
New Hampshire	22	8	5	8	1	0	291,500	251,778	252,509	55,000	0	850,787	98,701	
New Jersey	49	36	3	6	4	0	1,547,709	149,791	345,735	193,677	0	2,236,912	209,255	
New Mexico	33	19	7	4	2	1	438,995	287,675	260,130	53,768	1	1,040,569	134,465	
New York	127	56	37	29	1	4	2,428,484	1,659,174	1,632,777	315,617	275,492	6,311,544	701,370	
N. Mariana Islands	10	2	4	2	1	1	181,171	139,823	138,823	27,764	82,297	569,878	61,699	
North Carolina	76	29	18	11	6	12	2,749,557	2,050,743	1,888,273	590,276	1,297,901	8,576,750	557,473	
North Dakota	209	60	47	43	16	43	460,814	403,514	386,380	84,704	239,970	1,575,382	181,880	
Ohio	239	71	46	45	17	60	2,548,668	1,978,119	1,883,524	437,087	1,364,240	8,211,638	0	
Oklahoma	46	19	11	8	4	4	433,981	387,757	414,797	71,548	214,663	1,522,746	113,140	
Oregon	71	38	15	13	5	0	747,158	635,946	488,658	102,348	0	1,974,110	131,592	
Pennsylvania	188	62	62	62	2	0	2,929,165	1,710,168	1,781,992	411,688	0	6,833,013	0	
Puerto Rico	121	117	1	1	1	1	741,021	516,728	282,462	69,412	31,398	1,641,021	66,848	
Rhode Island	13	4	7	1	1	0	382,097	276,953	204,312	40,862	0	904,224	70,825	
South Carolina	51	25	12	9	3	2	1,382,698	758,254	758,784	130,544	158,273	3,188,553	218,054	
South Dakota	37	27	2	6	1	1	216,025	200,456	193,812	52,274	73,647	736,214	38,981	
Tennessee	61	27	17	10	5	2	879,623	646,569	635,872	131,928	70,364	2,364,356	118,730	
Texas	92	37	22	27	2	4	2,707,887	1,954,903	1,987,481	145,565	435,973	7,231,809	711,175	
Utah	134	47	39	26	7	15	1,156,986	1,018,891	1,103,888	154,389	546,557	3,980,711	215,453	
Vermont	93	35	22	19	5	12	283,295	0	253,842	40,222	0	577,359	36,337	
Virgin Islands	3	-	0	1	2	0	-	0	141,511	57,708	0	199,219	0	
Virginia	93	35	22	19	5	12	821,621	643,932	656,513	129,633	305,477	2,557,176	136,674	

	Number of subgrantee awards						Amount allocated to subgrantees (\$)						ADM
	Total	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	VS	LE	PRO	CRT	DISC	Total	
Washington	129	50	41	36	1	1	905,284	697,561	682,665	112,519	5,833	2,403,862	272,322
West Virginia	58	17	20	14	1	6	821,621	643,932	656,513	129,633	305,477	2,557,176	83,951
Wisconsin	51	23	10	11	3	4	979,459	1,100,273	276,302	321,822	12,890	2,690,746	186,445
Wyoming	62	23	7	2	23	7	196,297	169,491	169,491	33,883	101,695	670,857	0
TOTAL	3,740	1,493	914	801	270	262	51,371,186	36,592,875	34,993,756	7,327,841	7,952,147	138,237,805	10,844,065

Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2010

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Alabama	20	75	5	100
Alaska	24	73	3	100
American Samoa	50	50	0	100
Arizona	31	68	1	100
Arkansas	13	86	1	100
California	35	60	5	100
Colorado	21	75	4	100
Connecticut	30	70	0	100
Delaware	25	70	5	100
District of Columbia	40	58	2	100
Florida	16	82	2	100
Georgia	20	76	4	100
Guam	33	34	33	100
Hawaii	66	33	1	100
Idaho	15	80	5	100
Illinois	50	50	0	100
Indiana	20	78	2	100
Iowa	27	69	4	100
Kansas	15	79	6	100
Kentucky	79	21	0	100
Louisiana	22	74	4	100
Maine	36	63	1	100
Maryland	30	68	2	100
Massachusetts	60	35	5	100
Michigan	23	72	5	100
Minnesota	45	50	5	100
Mississippi	49	50	1	100
Missouri	18	80	2	100
Montana	19	70	11	100
Nebraska	15	73	12	100
Nevada	14	80	6	100
New Hampshire	25	70	5	100
New Jersey	60	40	0	100
New Mexico	30	55	15	100
New York	29	69	2	100
N. Mariana Islands	5	95	0	100
North Carolina	38	53	9	100
North Dakota	24	71	5	100
Ohio	13	81	6	100
Oklahoma	20	76	4	100
Oregon	25	75	0	100

Table A2b. Percentage distribution of STOP Program allocation, by type of victimization, by state: 2010

State	Sexual assault	Domestic violence	Stalking	Total
Pennsylvania	33	62	5	100
Puerto Rico	0	99	1	100
Rhode Island	28	69	3	100
South Carolina	55	40	5	100
South Dakota	15	77	8	100
Tennessee	15	83	2	100
Texas	17	80	3	100
Utah	10	88	2	100
Vermont	10	80	10	100
Virgin Islands	17	77	6	100
Virginia	19	78	3	100
Washington	25	65	10	100
West Virginia	20	68	12	100
Wisconsin	62	35	3	100
Wyoming	6	82	12	100

Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

State	2009 ⁶³			2010 ⁶⁴		
	Total amounts awarded to victim	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs	Total amounts awarded to victim	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
Alabama	605,500	150,000	24.8	771,353	163,500	21.2
Alaska	222,836	30,000	13.5	297,040	57,830	19.5
American Samoa	455,146	455,146	100	217,582	217,582	100
Arizona	834,383	64,320	7.7	833,939	64,320	7.7
Arkansas	330,148	60,636	18.4	337,313	78,570	23.3
California	3,452,555	1,049,663	30.4	4,301,657	1,150,212	26.7
Colorado	481,648	74,989	15.6	677,784	174,394	25.7
Connecticut	424,553	0	0	662,780	0	0
Delaware	354,609	46,931	13.2	366,138	48,571	13.3
District of Columbia	208,946	65,250	31.2	215,233	215,233	100
Florida	1,891,547	161,920	8.6	2,555,483	161,482	6.3
Georgia	1,602,093	257,573	16.1	1,391,536	470,247	33.8
Guam	349,634	349,634	100	353,057	105,219	29.8
Hawaii	418,779	153,019	36.5	372,196	76,085	20.4
Idaho	281,617	43,787	15.5	281,617	89,788	31.9
Illinois	0	0	0	1,185,970	0	0
Indiana	1,185,205	138,044	11.6	1,361,091	222,115	16.3
Iowa	546,695	46,530	8.5	629,715	61,469	9.8
Kansas	388,961	0	0	978,370	91,242	9.3
Kentucky	499,232	289,236	57.9	494,021	57,450	11.6
Louisiana	622,216	92,247	14.8	531,001	98,000	18.5
Maine	336,517	65,729	19.5	309,787	89,022	28.7
Maryland	742,624	81,748	11.0	616,856	267,657	43.4
Massachusetts	1,089,200	135,500	12.4	1,153,648	142,455	12.3
Michigan	1,520,883	191,167	12.6	1,417,624	115,417	8.1
Minnesota	859,270	141,106	16.4	625,600	431,079	68.9
Mississippi	586,392	119,756	20.4	1,148,183	153,169	13.3
Missouri	946,541	117,121	12.4	906,566	109,122	12.0
Montana	255,040	31,540	12.4	318,540	31,540	9.9
Nebraska	300,160	33,983	11.3	308,611	48,847	15.8
Nevada	456,090	23,600	5.2	0	0	0

⁶³The Illinois STOP administrator reported that no victim services awards were made in 2009. The STOP administrators in Connecticut, Wyoming, and Kansas did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

⁶⁴It appears that the Virgin Islands did not make victim services awards in 2010; the STOP administrators in Connecticut, Illinois, and Nevada did not report awards to culturally specific organizations.

Table A3b. Amount and percent of victim services funds awarded to culturally specific community-based organizations (CSCBO) by state, 2009 and 2010

State	2009 ⁶³			2010 ⁶⁴		
	Total amounts awarded to victim	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs	Total amounts awarded to victim	Amounts awarded to CSCBOs	Percent of victim services funds to CSCBOs
New Hampshire	304,872	30,000	9.8	291,500	40,000	13.7
New Jersey	897,553	133,480	14.9	1,547,709	179,500	11.6
New Mexico	309,990	101,874	32.9	438,995	71,198	16.2
New York	2,208,870	351,616	15.9	2,428,484	436,885	18.0
N. Mariana	243,346	16,890	6.9	181,171	14,583	8.0
North Carolina	2,239,510	312,121	13.9	183,645	178,741	97.3
North Dakota	445,217	41,636	9.4	460,814	47,997	10.4
Ohio	2,370,655	817,794	34.5	2,548,668	778,153	30.5
Oklahoma	477,348	97,937	20.5	433,981	56,028	12.9
Oregon	704,507	49,418	7.0	747,158	57,207	7.7
Pennsylvania	800,334	377,545	47.2	2,929,165	708,581	24.2
Puerto Rico	475,091	160,151	33.7	741,021	347,767	46.9
Rhode Island	368,077	23,833	6.5	382,097	24,517	6.4
South Carolina	546,101	83,055	15.2	1,382,698	205,000	14.8
South Dakota	235,664	39,693	16.8	216,025	30,885	14.3
Tennessee	962,949	89,317	9.3	879,623	89,317	10.2
Texas	2,960,368	1,241,330	41.9	2,707,887	1,310,441	48.4
Utah	368,697	98,722	26.8	311,767	459,054	147.2
Vermont	293,133	45,000	15.4	283,295	30,000	10.6
Virgin Islands	543,275	543,275	100	0	0	0
Virginia	770,607	74,908	9.7	821,621	81,958	10.0
Washington	884,995	130,088	14.7	905,284	113,980	12.6
West Virginia	372,309	37,250	10.0	355,983	77,609	21.8
Wisconsin	738,666	243,088	32.9	979,459	289,889	29.6
Wyoming	13,583	0	0	196,297	13,250	6.7
TOTAL	42,784,737	9,610,196	22.5	47,974,638	10,634,157	22.2

Appendix B 2010

Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Alabama	35	13	5	4	5	10	3	24	11	10	0	0	0
Alaska	19	14	3	5	1	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	17	14	5	7	1	4	3	13	2	3	1	2	0
Arkansas	26	5	0	2	0	19	0	9	9	4	0	0	0
California	98	46	15	18	5	26	4	84	11	11	0	8	0
Colorado	39	20	11	5	1	8	6	27	0	5	0	0	0
Connecticut	8	5	3	4	1	4	1	3	2	1	0	0	1
Delaware	13	3	1	1	2	3	0	10	1	1	1	1	0
District of Columbia	6	3	1	1	0	3	1	6	0	1	0	0	0
Florida	39	7	5	7	2	23	4	22	15	9	1	0	0
Georgia	59	31	16	16	8	23	12	33	9	11	0	0	0
Guam	9	4	1	5	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	18	11	1	2	0	11	1	10	2	3	0	0	0
Idaho	15	6	3	3	2	1	3	14	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	11	8	0	4	1	3	0	19	5	5	0	4	0
Indiana	77	41	17	17	7	19	7	54	5	19	0	0	0
Iowa	70	33	20	6	11	36	7	30	22	10	0	0	0
Kansas	23	9	1	3	3	6	0	16	1	5	1	0	1
Kentucky	30	9	3	5	0	8	2	20	7	3	0	0	0
Louisiana	71	16	8	6	14	27	3	43	20	8	2	0	0
Maine	23	10	4	6	3	6	3	12	7	1	0	0	0
Maryland	67	21	14	9	9	15	8	48	4	4	0	1	1
Massachusetts	42	20	7	18	1	5	4	33	3	2	0	0	0
Michigan	49	24	13	7	8	9	6	47	2	4	0	0	0
Minnesota	26	15	13	14	7	2	7	10	0	0	0	1	0
Mississippi	33	6	1	1	1	2	1	17	10	4	0	0	0
Missouri	61	18	10	8	3	16	4	43	10	7	2	0	3
Montana	21	11	4	4	5	4	4	13	4	1	0	0	0

Table B1b. Number of STOP Program awards reported by activities funded, by state: 2010

State	Staff	Training	Policies	Products	Data collection and communication systems	Specialized units	System improvement	Victim services	Law enforcement	Prosecution	Courts	Probation and parole	BIP
Nebraska	12	9	8	2	2	7	3	8	2	5	0	1	2
Nevada	32	14	6	9	4	7	4	31	1	1	0	0	0
New Hampshire	21	11	7	7	2	8	1	12	3	6	1	0	0
New Jersey	60	25	14	14	7	0	7	53	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	35	18	5	9	6	6	6	18	2	4	0	0	0
New York	115	69	38	37	19	30	7	94	11	21	0	2	2
North Carolina	59	29	22	16	12	24	8	31	13	5	2	0	1
North Dakota	31	12	6	4	6	2	4	26	2	0	0	0	2
N. Mariana Islands	5	4	3	0	3	5	2	2	0	1	1	2	0
Ohio	71	20	11	9	5	14	4	57	9	7	0	0	0
Oklahoma	33	14	7	8	4	12	2	16	6	6	0	3	0
Oregon	57	23	7	7	3	4	9	49	0	2	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	31	26	18	12	4	20	7	29	17	20	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	11	2	1	0	0	1	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
Rhode Island	10	7	2	2	2	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	41	19	12	15	8	12	5	27	4	6	0	0	1
South Dakota	35	7	6	6	2	3	5	31	0	6	0	0	1
Tennessee	45	18	6	15	4	10	1	29	5	6	1	0	0
Texas	107	38	13	11	11	34	8	67	13	17	1	0	0
Utah	40	24	10	11	8	6	7	31	4	2	1	0	0
Vermont	11	9	4	1	2	6	3	9	5	5	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	91	60	15	61	12	24	5	60	13	10	0	1	0
Washington	81	30	3	3	11	6	3	60	11	6	0	0	0
West Virginia	20	7	5	5	2	1	2	12	12	9	0	0	1
Wisconsin	40	31	11	10	5	10	9	13	5	4	0	0	0
Wyoming	31	5	1	2	2	1	0	30	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	2133	954	426	464	249	548	212	1496	301	283	15	26	16

Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010

State	Subgrantees		Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
	Subgrants	using funds for victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
Alabama	35	24	7145	6886	259	0	7145	6227	845	73
Alaska	20	15	2291	2074	11	206	2085	1649	371	65
American Samoa	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	18	13	5982	5961	17	4	5978	5481	453	44
Arkansas	26	9	3844	3843	1	0	3844	3595	226	23
California	100	84	14664	13007	1344	313	14351	9090	5016	245
Colorado	39	27	7672	7115	547	10	7662	6168	1420	74
Connecticut	12	3	1144	1144	0	0	1144	561	583	0
Delaware	14	10	2744	2681	60	3	2741	2476	258	7
District of Columbia	8	6	1121	719	2	400	721	353	348	20
Florida	39	22	19420	18258	978	184	19236	17304	1476	456
Georgia	60	33	12390	11719	595	76	12314	7461	4575	278
Guam	9	6	941	939	0	2	939	713	200	26
Hawaii	28	10	718	715	3	0	718	447	271	0
Idaho	16	14	2939	2626	140	173	2766	2224	358	184
Illinois	21	19	22990	22924	64	2	22988	21133	1852	3
Indiana	79	54	10996	10585	383	28	10968	10027	674	267
Iowa	83	30	5334	5122	78	134	5200	4627	524	49
Kansas	24	16	5294	5139	155	0	5294	4724	276	294
Kentucky	31	20	7264	7155	81	28	7236	6857	348	31
Louisiana	78	43	17109	16986	84	39	17070	15092	1854	124
Maine	29	12	3283	2743	507	33	3250	2799	394	57
Maryland	69	48	8626	8405	176	45	8581	7658	838	85
Massachusetts	42	33	8139	7838	248	53	8086	7323	698	65
Michigan	49	47	15665	15433	171	61	15604	13469	1389	746
Minnesota	27	10	1787	1729	49	9	1778	1136	641	1
Mississippi	33	17	4098	3754	262	82	4016	3512	467	37
Missouri	62	43	13463	11601	1429	433	13030	10540	1767	723
Montana	23	13	2473	2281	187	5	2468	1897	445	126
Nebraska	12	8	5009	4757	252	0	5009	4704	189	116
Nevada	36	31	13031	12690	327	14	13017	11436	480	1101

Table B2b. Number of STOP Program subgrantees using funds for victim services and victims/survivors seeking/receiving services, by state: 2010

State	Subgrants	Subgrantees	Victims/survivors seeking services				Victims receiving services			
		using funds for victim services	Total	Served	Partially served	Not served	Total	Domestic violence	Sexual assault	Stalking
New Hampshire	22	12	2424	2266	49	109	2315	1510	654	151
New Jersey	65	53	8784	8678	34	72	8712	7151	1556	5
New Mexico	38	18	2685	2609	54	22	2663	2207	349	107
New York	115	94	27473	23728	2608	1137	26336	22628	3522	186
North Carolina	67	31	6826	6521	249	56	6770	5314	1091	365
North Dakota	35	26	1367	1355	9	3	1364	1145	180	39
N. Mariana Islands	7	2	375	373	2	0	375	343	31	1
Ohio	72	57	17158	16671	413	74	17084	15392	1212	480
Oklahoma	34	16	2921	2891	17	13	2908	2510	349	49
Oregon	58	49	7805	7450	184	171	7634	6204	1252	178
Pennsylvania	32	29	14287	13858	254	175	14112	10855	3035	222
Puerto Rico	11	9	5799	4886	913	0	5799	5722	23	54
Rhode Island	10	8	6746	6014	357	375	6371	6042	301	28
South Carolina	46	27	8291	8250	16	25	8266	6476	1549	241
South Dakota	35	31	5893	5824	36	33	5860	4524	286	1050
Tennessee	45	29	3991	3891	82	18	3973	3548	300	125
Texas	112	67	42030	40425	888	717	41313	38636	2397	280
Utah	42	31	9420	9016	310	94	9326	8211	532	583
Vermont	13	9	1169	1147	19	3	1166	924	181	61
Virgin Islands	3	3	712	589	121	2	710	694	14	2
Virginia	92	60	14717	13995	527	195	14522	12363	1974	185
Washington	94	60	5139	5139	0	0	5139	4632	445	62
West Virginia	21	12	5161	5145	16	0	5161	4995	140	26
Wisconsin	43	13	4887	3961	628	298	4589	1860	2598	131
Wyoming	31	30	1815	1797	17	1	1814	1516	124	174
TOTAL	2274	1496	435451	413308	16213	5930	429521	366085	53331	10105

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Alabama	2515	15	31	2	164	4059	408	6144	842	159	282	1381	3554	239	1689
Alaska	51	788	50	34	126	888	155	1895	136	54	97	417	1395	77	99
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	257	147	50	4	2188	2668	745	4919	971	88	208	1102	3891	320	457
Arkansas	1155	18	46	4	169	2430	22	3233	555	56	314	955	2206	127	242
California	1970	635	390	111	4450	4228	2584	11619	1486	1246	1058	3368	7114	366	2445
Colorado	278	66	51	21	1728	3475	2050	5899	559	1204	389	1373	4129	149	1622
Connecticut	189	6	8	1	635	284	21	1087	57	0	108	241	702	26	67
Delaware	749	11	13	5	274	1642	51	2485	237	19	75	598	1959	85	24
District of Columbia	138	0	2	0	216	19	346	364	13	344	3	123	176	70	349
Florida	4735	51	100	65	2574	8667	3105	16379	2322	535	594	3844	9164	662	4972
Georgia	4782	17	137	4	854	4171	2397	10919	431	964	1285	1613	5970	241	3205
Guam	10	4	149	723	3	34	19	787	152	0	185	187	506	38	23
Hawaii	6	2	73	159	15	138	325	688	30	0	50	92	252	41	283
Idaho	37	322	18	9	531	1768	99	2619	147	0	141	638	1836	120	31
Illinois	9193	125	256	34	4183	9233	821	21481	1404	103	874	4993	14992	1188	941
Indiana	2396	17	65	9	1568	6443	485	10349	581	38	486	2406	7115	431	530
Iowa	606	121	68	6	920	3381	152	4839	351	10	192	1544	3146	194	124
Kansas	1156	27	70	6	708	3230	107	4496	789	9	120	1404	3565	172	33
Kentucky	683	16	46	11	590	5603	287	6685	542	9	145	1529	4919	213	430
Louisiana	8438	53	77	5	367	7952	222	14750	2188	132	824	3725	11006	450	1065
Maine	102	13	31	3	23	3038	40	2919	330	1	194	942	1948	92	74
Maryland	2971	3	123	5	1392	3663	424	7728	691	162	278	1848	5304	222	929
Massachusetts	981	18	137	3	1890	4280	793	7338	693	55	358	1732	5417	338	241
Michigan	4547	156	66	15	1947	8272	615	14641	925	38	417	3918	10245	512	512

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	Black/ African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino	White	Unknown	Female	Male	Unknown	13-17	18-24	25-29	60+	Unknown
Minnesota	136	636	25	0	391	447	143	1700	78	0	331	577	707	53	110
Mississippi	1955	52	14	3	92	1780	120	3773	208	35	258	1054	2342	76	286
Missouri	4041	133	49	27	457	8086	270	12018	999	13	427	3138	8720	414	331
Montana	17	331	5	13	95	2027	50	2102	294	72	368	436	1559	66	39
Nebraska	401	105	28	3	416	3675	381	4468	394	147	74	1270	3076	74	515
Nevada	1517	237	238	52	4000	6938	35	11344	1668	5	326	2778	8619	751	543
New Hampshire	76	1	17	1	117	1810	298	1961	337	17	231	449	1286	46	303
New Jersey	1504	5	510	2	1966	3640	1105	7324	501	887	351	1689	5058	270	1344
New Mexico	51	137	42	5	1562	764	103	2388	231	44	118	563	1833	56	93
New York	6063	255	703	71	3995	13553	1851	23659	2519	158	1637	5940	15839	1052	1868
North Carolina	1908	13	171	6	513	3131	1066	5649	770	351	530	1422	3426	287	1105
North Dakota	48	199	7	3	44	1023	51	1263	101	0	63	343	932	23	3
N. Mariana Islands	0	0	59	249	0	9	62	353	22	0	34	52	285	4	0
Ohio	2367	37	111	8	506	10941	3141	15835	1190	59	661	3698	10036	613	2076
Oklahoma	291	355	17	3	407	1829	8	2738	170	0	132	597	2063	89	27
Oregon	215	276	49	66	1336	4860	877	6951	663	20	297	1403	4999	252	683
Pennsylvania	1540	20	81	15	976	9832	1656	13060	1012	40	788	3068	9257	395	604
Puerto Rico	3	0	0	0	5665	121	10	5704	95	0	87	1217	3305	167	1023
Rhode Island	837	64	61	1	752	4367	289	5403	832	136	212	2827	2907	282	143
South Carolina	3095	34	33	1	251	4147	705	7455	797	14	429	1824	5110	142	761
South Dakota	193	2046	32	2	142	2992	547	4943	894	23	273	1214	3684	251	438
Tennessee	875	56	21	2	316	2642	61	3646	327	0	109	895	2804	128	37
Texas	8291	162	488	24	17091	12184	3095	35543	3646	2124	1724	9473	26300	1309	2507
Utah	273	290	142	115	2332	5736	477	8838	441	47	248	2185	6344	326	223
Vermont	23	6	6	2	25	892	213	1141	25	0	48	287	674	42	115
Virgin Islands	430	2	1	1	149	32	95	548	153	9	177	61	399	19	54

Table B3b. Race/ethnicity, gender, and age of victims/survivors receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Race/ethnicity							Gender			Age				
	<i>Black/ African American</i>	<i>American Indian/Alaska Native</i>	<i>Asian</i>	<i>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</i>	<i>Hispanic/Latino</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>13-17</i>	<i>18-24</i>	<i>25-29</i>	<i>60+</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
Virginia	4400	20	246	23	1224	8155	479	12945	1558	19	685	3091	9940	503	303
Washington	221	220	178	41	1199	3280	0	5049	90	0	81	1199	3543	315	1
West Virginia	244	9	22	26	27	3638	1195	4529	503	129	210	764	2636	235	1316
Wisconsin	707	174	164	4	1328	1923	289	3893	478	218	340	924	2646	149	530
Wyoming	34	43	5	2	230	1473	43	1625	188	1	35	350	1101	138	190
TOTAL	89701	8549	5582	2010	75119	215493	34988	382111	37616	9794	19961	94761	261941	14900	37958

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Alabama	287	45	21	1607
Alaska	207	97	119	1476
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Arizona	306	642	761	1250
Arkansas	39	169	0	310
California	836	1688	812	1764
Colorado	531	564	260	1569
Connecticut	107	278	47	260
Delaware	106	176	150	675
District of Columbia	31	179	124	0
Florida	1019	1160	780	2644
Georgia	351	601	588	2549
Guam	35	492	487	577
Hawaii	37	18	5	258
Idaho	288	271	293	1364
Illinois	658	3136	89	1403
Indiana	544	1456	1011	2134
Iowa	510	800	768	3006
Kansas	177	248	94	1606
Kentucky	765	511	516	4199
Louisiana	899	265	116	10097
Maine	195	47	144	2555
Maryland	287	1404	767	3124
Massachusetts	465	1687	1042	950
Michigan	1043	840	369	3867
Minnesota	228	101	112	1531
Mississippi	162	37	9	1744
Missouri	1352	266	200	5063
Montana	202	5	4	784
Nebraska	120	228	167	1697
Nevada	678	2268	686	2268
New Hampshire	262	47	42	229
New Jersey	420	1240	764	376
New Mexico	99	626	517	1503
New York	2010	2293	2094	5636
North Carolina	536	426	251	1984
North Dakota	116	25	20	324
N. Mariana Islands	1	191	40	281
Ohio	1232	381	162	6226

Table B4b. Number of individuals with disabilities/limited English proficiency/who are immigrants/living in rural areas receiving STOP Program-funded services, by state: 2010

State	Disabled	Limited English proficiency	Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	Live in rural areas
Oklahoma	258	303	114	1732
Oregon	551	924	553	4731
Pennsylvania	1173	385	96	4091
Puerto Rico	357	116	201	1033
Rhode Island	5	327	14	8
South Carolina	317	214	145	2383
South Dakota	158	81	45	2224
Tennessee	339	222	257	2552
Texas	2060	7300	3128	7150
Utah	473	1378	1052	3275
Vermont	161	11	10	1065
Virgin Islands	8	96	45	0
Virginia	657	836	600	4277
Washington	230	454	225	1866
West Virginia	293	27	9	1654
Wisconsin	439	1182	1034	175
Wyoming	97	27	14	778
TOTAL	24717	38791	21973	117884

Table B5b. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2010

State	<i>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
Alabama	3602	651	1137	387	70	1337
Alaska	1361	306	99	238	62	137
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	4082	862	328	286	52	400
Arkansas	1672	622	1066	164	32	292
California	5786	1394	2093	1680	653	3047
Colorado	4599	264	668	286	88	1804
Connecticut	649	199	29	132	53	82
Delaware	2300	203	144	73	56	75
District of Columbia	312	29	51	5	0	344
Florida	9354	1995	2038	441	143	5546
Georgia	4210	1859	1320	1336	505	3948
Guam	353	212	240	73	17	52
Hawaii	318	64	28	55	25	228
Idaho	2005	380	642	270	103	61
Illinois	13588	2628	6134	1022	429	1118
Indiana	7417	787	1895	488	68	570
Iowa	3659	271	890	223	47	273
Kansas	3561	385	754	203	51	362
Kentucky	5008	766	1122	167	24	228
Louisiana	10382	1680	2153	950	292	1978
Maine	2371	340	325	84	12	165
Maryland	6834	177	816	498	130	453
Massachusetts	4488	1118	1953	313	123	300
Michigan	9035	1028	4733	569	204	312
Minnesota	800	363	133	211	222	49
Mississippi	2184	431	1161	213	12	53
Missouri	7915	1273	2428	939	355	467
Montana	954	243	341	160	38	749
Nebraska	2892	269	1430	92	11	328
Nevada	7129	1015	2778	317	97	1946
New Hampshire	764	442	453	345	45	359
New Jersey	5035	431	988	326	167	1821
New Mexico	1874	223	112	206	95	171
New York	15530	3240	4565	1531	555	1381
North Carolina	3151	696	1452	433	181	1418
North Dakota	1034	82	63	116	30	46

Table B5b. Victims/survivors' relationships to offender for victims/survivors served with STOP Program funds, by state: 2010

State	<i>Current/former spouse or intimate partner</i>	<i>Other family or household member</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Acquaintance</i>	<i>Stranger</i>	<i>Relationship unknown</i>
N. Mariana Islands	94	63	245	2	5	1
Ohio	9879	2348	4690	742	193	471
Oklahoma	2371	706	799	537	312	75
Oregon	5135	516	647	450	97	868
Pennsylvania	8275	2014	1259	1339	223	1140
Puerto Rico	4166	8	228	3	33	1364
Rhode Island	3554	852	1941	171	50	45
South Carolina	5194	749	924	612	137	745
South Dakota	2821	469	320	106	7	2193
Tennessee	2459	445	640	196	40	205
Texas	27008	5245	5553	654	182	3633
Utah	6611	1060	732	518	90	350
Vermont	852	129	206	49	8	39
Virgin Islands	434	196	23	42	4	11
Virginia	10808	1829	1060	731	183	259
Washington	3251	595	1109	162	36	1
West Virginia	3619	690	732	67	22	34
Wisconsin	1434	777	686	539	122	1056
Wyoming	926	222	404	155	19	112
TOTAL	255099	45841	68760	21907	6810	44502